Sam.
Drugs
Opium

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part II. 20th November, 1893.

PRICE ONE PENNY, or ONE ANNA, for each daily part.

Published by the
Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade,
Broadway Chambers, London, S. W.
Also at the
Methodist Publishing House, 45, Dharamtala St., Calcutta.

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Bishop Thoburn's Evidence.

The Rev. J. M. Thoburn, D.D. examined, stated, in answer to questions by the President, as follows :—I am a missionary, and am at present Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in India and Malaysia. I have been thirty-four years in the East, and have personal experience in almost all parts of India. My present duty is to superintend all the Methodist Churches in the Indian Empire. We have missions among thirteen different races, and I am expected to visit all these every year, and I have therefore had a very wide field of observation. We have a large number of Natives under our supervision, about 50,000, chiefly in Northern India, but we have some of all these races. In my early life in India, I spent a great deal of time among villagers, and had opportunities of ascertaining their views on public questions, and I am convinced that the habit of opium-eating is a very great evil, but not so much in villages as in towns. I have had opportunities of comparing Indian Natives with the Chinese in Singapore and Penang, and in every place I regard the opium habit as a very bad habit and very deleterious to those who indulge in it ; but it is very much more mischievous among the Chinese than among the Natives of India. The opium habit is worse in Rajputana than in Rohilkund; whilst in Kumaon and Garhwal and many other parts of India it is not used at all. The physical condition of the people of the Punjab is very satisfactory when they are not under the effect of this or any other pernicious habit ; they are a finer race naturally than the people in many other parts of India. The lower classes of Rajputana are an inferior set of men. The opium habit is certainly more prevalent among the lower classes than among men of the superior classes. There is very great difference in the hold the opium habit has upon different persons ; some can give it up without much trouble ; with others it is nearly impossible. I have been told by intelligent Chinamen that it has a peculiar hold upon those of their countrymen who indulge in the habit ; it has a fascination for them, and they cannot give it up without extreme suffering. It would be difficult to form an estimate of the proportion of the population who indulge in the habit temperately, and those who take it in excess ; but, as a general rule, you can tell a man who takes

opium in excess by his countenance. Speaking roughly, I would say that, among those who are in a position to get it, about one-half use it in excess; among others, about one-tenth. Habitual consumers of opium among the poor expend about one-eighth of their earnings, which, as a minimum, would mean, say, one pice; the maximum, to a man of the labouring class, would be about four pice, the earnings of that class ranging from eight to twelve pice a day. At the lowest, a man spends about one-eighth, at the highest, from one-third to one-half. It is very common for them to spend one-half, and as the highest of the class earn about twelve pice, it follows that their children suffer from insufficiency of food. There are some forty or fifty millions of people in India who have insufficient food as it is, and if one-third of a labourer's income is taken for indulgence in the opium habit, it follows that it must cause suffering among their children. I think the worst of the evil is that it is the cause of the starvation of millions of children. This applies to Rajputana more particularly, to my certain knowledge, and it is much the same among the poorer classes in the Punjab. The classes which are called the "depressed classes" are the same in all parts of the empire.

Q.—Can you give a general view as to your experience as to the results of the opium habit physically, mentally, and morally?

A.—Physically, where opium is used at all to excess, it undoubtedly weakens the constitution after a very few years. It differs, however, in individuals; some may take it for many years without much apparent harm; but, if you take fifty confirmed opium smokers, you would find that forty were physically affected; they show it at a glance. With regard to those who eat opium, the effects are not so bad; there is a great difference between eating opium and smoking or drinking it. In the Punjab opium is chiefly taken in a solid form; sometimes they mix it with other substances, but that is more commonly done in Rajputana.

Q.—Have you any experience as to the value of opium as a protective against fever.

A.—I think that is a popular delusion. I have never met a doctor who prescribed opium in any form as a protective against fever, or a cure for fever. The natives of India, especially the poorer classes, are subject to all manner of delusions. They believe that anything which makes a man feel more comfortable is doing them good and it undoubtedly makes them feel the effects less. I have been in districts where the natives expose children in the rain as a cure for measles.

Q.—On this point you give your belief, as a layman ?

A.—Certainly ; but I have had experience in the most sickly places and swamps where they never use opium, and where some of our Civil Surgeons say that it does protect them from fever they don't obtain exemption from fevers.

Q.—Have you any experience of the value of opium as enabling people to bear an unusual amount of bodily toil ?

A—I have given some attention to the point. They can carry heavy burdens, perhaps to the extent of fifty per cent more, within a given time : but they have no powers of endurance, and ultimately it tends to break them down. At Singapore, where there are about ten thousand jinrikshaw drawers, I am told that they use opium to give them strength and endurance, but the reaction which ensues must, in the nature of the cases, and it undoubtedly does, break down the constitution. Intelligent Chinese connected with the administration of the public revenue at Singapore, told me that those ten thousand men don't live on the average more that seven years. I asked an intelligent physician if that statement was correct, and he said that it undoubtedly did shorten their lives very much.

Q.—Have you anything to tell us with reference to the manner in which the opium habit is regarded by public opinion from a moral point of view ?

A.—The opium habit is considered a public vice generally, and in sections where it is more common it is in less disfavour. Wherever the Hindustani language is spoken, the term "aphimi" is used, and is regarded as a term of abuse. It has a sting which does not belong to the epithet "drunkard." An opium eater is regarded as untrustworthy ; he would steal or do anything to get the drug. Hence in most parts of India it is considered disreputable.

Q.—Do you think that persons who consume opium are generally unreliable and dishonest ?

A.—Yes, unless they are well-to-do men ; if they have not the money and become confirmed in the habit, I would not trust them. I would not trust their word, but I cannot say that ordinarily a man who takes opium is dishonest or untruthful.

Q.—In China it is a matter of common knowledge that many natives, who are employed in confidential positions, are more or less consumors of opium.

A.—I don't deny it. I have stood before an opium den in a street hard by and watched the people entering it. I found that the lowest

amount a man spent in his purchase was two annas, and the largest was one and-a-half rupees. When a poor man must have a large quantity of opium daily, there is only one way for him to get it.

Q.—With regard to the licensing system, do you consider that the restriction upon the production and sale of opium is regarded as an evil.

A.—I should say that anything put upon sale publicly will have its sale increased, no matter what the article is. Then when you add to that the authority of the Government, the people generally think that because it is under Government restriction its value is enhanced, and that tends to increase the sale.

Q.—Suppose the Government did not consider itself called upon to prohibit the sale of opium ; the imposition of license duty on the sale, or the levy of export duty must, to that extent, be a restraining influence.

A.—It is a charge upon it, and my idea is that the sale will be increased by any policy except prohibition. If you close a few shops it is so much in favour of morality, but as long as you keep enough shops open to supply the public, in the nature of the case the use of opium will continue to increase.

Q.—But the system of licences to a certain extent is a restriction as compared with free sale.

A.—Certainly ; anything that reduces the number of shops is better than free trade.

Q.—Can you tell whether the prohibition of the consumption of opium on the premises has been fully carried out in Calcutta yet ?

A—I think it is carried out as far as I know everywhere now : in Calcutta it has been carried out since March or April last.

Q.—Have the results of this prohibition been beneficial.

A.—I think undoubtedly they have. There have been some private opium clubs set up in Bombay, and I am told in this city, but they will do much less harm than the opium dens which used to exist.

Q.—As you consider it desirable to prohibit the sale of opium, would public opinion be in favour of such a measure ?

A.—I say without exception, that if you leave a million of people from the higher classes and from thirty to fifty millions from the lowest classes out of consideration, the balance of the people would be overwhelmingly in favour of closing opium shops.

Q.—Do you recognise any exceptional difficulty in the carrying out of such a measure by a Government like the British Government of India ?

A.—Nothing very difficult, but they would have to consider the question of confirmed opium eaters ; I should be glad to see some consideration shown in such cases.

Q.—Supposing a policy of prohibition were adopted, how would you propose that the loss of revenue resulting from such prohibition should be met. Would you be prepared to propose additional taxation, or can you suggest economies or other means of meeting the difficulty ?

A.—I am not a British subject, and therefore I feel a little hesitancy in expressing an opinion, but I must say that the people of India are extremely sensitive about any increase of taxation. If assured on that point, they would be almost unanimously in favour of doing away with the production and sale of opium. But if I may be allowed a single suggestion, I would say that if tobacco were put in the place of opium, it would yield almost the same revenue ; certainly one-half. And if the British Government were to take into consideration the fact that the heaviest portion of the military expenditure is incurred in the North-West Provinces and on the North-West frontier, and, would regard it is an Imperial and not an Indian question, and, in view of that fact, if the Imperial Government would pay a part, if not the whole, of the military expenditure on the North-Western frontier, this question would disappear.

Q.—Are you aware that, by a declaration of the representatives of the British Foreign Office in the House of Commons, the position now taken up by the British Government in regard to opium is this, that it is free to the Government of China to adopt any policy they think fit in regard to the importation of opium.

A.—I am aware of that. As to the political view of the question, I don't feel competent to express any opinion.

Q.—Do you regard this matter as a moral one ?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—Do you think there is any danger of the habit spreading among the Indian people generally ?

A.—I think, if the present policy is pursued, it will. I think there is great danger, because the people are becoming more prosperous, and if they had the means, and if the sale is within their reach, there is the great danger of its spreading all over the Empire and becoming a very common habit.

Q.—Do you know anything of the statistics of consumption in India

A.—I do not.

Q.—You are not prepared to say what the statistics would show as to increased consumption as per head of the population ?

A.—I have had no opportunity of collecting statistics.

By Sir William Roberts. Q.—I think you said that the evil effects of opium-taking were seen in some districts and not in others. Do you know of any malarial district where there is not a belief in the saving power of opium ?

A.—In the Terai districts of Rohilkund, about thirty years ago, I never heard of opium being used, though it is the most malarial district in all India. I should have discovered it if the opium habit had been there.

Q.—Is that the only district you can speak of ?

A.—I am told that in some of the districts in Lower Bengal it is not used ; in others it is, but I cannot speak from personal observation.

Q.—You have heard it said that it enables a man to do with less food ?

A.—I believe it does : he does eat less when he has the opium habit.

Q.—You are aware that the belief in the prophylactic power of opium in India is not confined to ignorant people ?

A.—When I first came to India people thought that we could not do without alcoholic drink.

Q.—Do you regard drinking as an equally bad vice ?

A.—It is like asking which is worse—a cobra, or a kerait. People who drink alcohol are willing that their children should learn the habit, but it is not so in the case of opium-taking.

Q.—You are aware that it is a common custom for them to administer small quantities of opium to their children ?

A.—It is a very pernicious habit, and is complained about. Natives generally regard it as a vicious practice, and it leads to the death of many children, and certainly injures many permanently. I know a case of one of our own missionaries whose infant had been drugged by a native nurse, and almost lost his life.

In answer to Mr. Pease and Mr. Wilson the witness said : I have not noticed any difference in the toleration of opium between Europeans and Natives. We do not admit any personal use of opium, and if the habit is acquired, we put our people under discipline. The use of opium, in my opinion, is inconsistent with a correct Christian life. It creates certain vices, which no other habit does. I once asked the

Commissioner of Police why he closed opium shops at 6 P.M., and left liquor shops open up to 9 P.M., and he said, that if he did not do so, all the bad characters of the city would be found congregated there, and he dared not leave them open. Opium-smoking takes the moral stamina out of a man. The head-quarters of my mission are in the United States. We have about eighty foreign missionaries, and a large number, something over a thousand, of native preachers of all classes, some of them medical missionaries. The Rajputs are the descendants of the ancient warrior-castes of India. They used to be a kind of aristocracy and at the present time they would still be regarded for the most part as forming a sort of an aristocracy, though very much reduced. This would refer in that province to the upper classes ; and people, when they use this term, refer to these people as belonging to a particular caste. As a matter of fact, I never knew one doctor who used opium as a medicine in cases of fever. I have been told by doctors that it does good as a preventive against fewer ; but I never found one use it himself for that purpose. I regard the whole thing as a myth. There are several forms of using opium. Smoking is held as its worst abuse, worse than eating or drinking it ; but indulgence in any form of it gets a man a reputation which is by no means favourable. Opium-smoking is more common in China, and eating it is more common in India. There are a number of races in India, and I do not think it would be practicable or desirable to discriminate in any way between one race, or one part of the country, and another, as far as the opium habit is concerned. India has become cosmopolitan, and it would be impossible to draw a line between them. I referred to the use of opium being worse than the use of alcohol, in the sense that it undoubtedly leads to immorality in the sensual sense of the word. I was told by a gentleman in Singapore, who had gone in disguise through its streets, that there was not a public woman in the city who was not a opium-smoker. I have been often told that. It was accessory to that vice, and it was kept for that purpose.

Q.—By Mr. Mowbray.—You have told us that a large number of children are actually starved in consequence of the waste of money upon opium by their parents ; have you any reason to think that, if parents spent less upon opium, they would not waste their money either upon alcohol or *ganja?*

A.—What I meant was that the infants were receiving insufficient food.

Q.—Therefore to prevent the evil which you point out, it would be necessary to go a great deal further and prohibit other things.

A— *Ganja* ought to be prohibited, no doubt; and the liquor habit produces the same results. Under the Bengal outstill system, the worst thing was the starvation of children. I have been to Guzerat and Kuteh, about Baroda and Ahmedabad, but my knowledge of Guzerat is very limited.

To Mr. Fanshawe.—I lived first in Kumaon, then in Garhwal and Rohilkund, and have frequently been in the Doab. I have had very little experience of the Panjab. When I spoke of the opium habit starving children, I alluded to the practice among what we call the "depressed classes" in all these provinces, and I spoke of the two hundred and eighty millions all over, including Bengal. I was speaking of all India when I said that there would be an overwhelming majority of the people in favour of prohibition. I have been in about six or seven provinces, about half over India. I have expressed the opinion that smoking opium was more deleterious than eating it. If the people can get the money they will go on increasing the dose, but the majority cannot get the money. Those who can eat two pice worth do so; those who can only get one pice, take one pice worth. But the tendency in all cases is to increase the dose, and they are only limited according to their means. This is what I have been told. This habit continues all through the year; I have not noticed any difference.

By Sir James Lyall.—You have used the word drunkard; what is the native term people use for the word drunkard?

A.—It differs; *mutwallah* is a very common word.

Q.—Do you really think that the term *mutwallah* is a less opprobrious term than the word *aphimi?*

A.—I think so.

Q.—Does not the term *aphimi* apply to what is called an opium sot?

A.—It corresponds with the term drunkard, but it has a sting in it that the word drunkard has not.

Q.—If the use of opium as a stimulant were stopped, would it not be likely that the poorer classes would spend as much money or more upon buying spirits or hemp drugs?

A.—I should say that the same policy should apply to ganja and spirits as well.

Q.—You would have a general system working?

A.—I think any of these drugs or drinks in the case of these very poor people proves a scourge.

Q.—You do it amongst the people of your own church. If you find a man beginning to take opium you bring him into discipline, as you term it, and the same as regards hemp drugs or spirits ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Opium is, I think, you know, used in India by the common people in villages, who form a great mass, for medicinal purposes, for themselves and their cattle too. You propose that it should be prohibited except for medicinal purposes. Have you ever tried to think out how opium could be readily supplied for medical wants, and yet its use prohibited as a stimulant and intoxicant ?

A.—I have thought a little over the subject. I do not think there are insuperable difficulties, but there would be a difficulty, no doubt. I have seen it tried in my own country in places where they have prohibition. It is always attended with difficulty, but they have succeeded in doing it.

Q.—Alcoholic drinks are not used as medicine as much as opium.

A.—I don't know that ; I think they are used as much. Some forms of drink are constantly used as medicine.

Q.—Anybody knows that the great difficulty in administration is to get reliable officers. If you give an ordinary native of India some powers or discretion he does very often make money out of it ?

A.—I understand that.

Q.—Even if your views were carried out, how could you possibly get a system by which opium could be made available at one's doors ?

A.—I think it would be no worse than it is now. I have just been in Garhwal where they have no opium whatever, and they get along very well without it. I don't value opium very much as a medicine, and I don't think it is what would be called a medical necessity among the common villagers. There must be a multitude of villages where they never see it.

Q.—You suggested that a tax could be put upon tobacco, which would raise as much money as opium ; are you aware that an attempt to put a tax upon tobacco by the Shah of Persia lead to a grievous revolt ?

A.—I should not think the Shah ought to be mentioned in the same connection with the Governor-General. I think the Governor-General could do a thing without difficulty, which the Shah would not dare to try. I may say I should not have ventured to make the suggestion if I had not read that the same suggestion had been originally in the mind of Sir John Strachey. He estimated that they could get a revenue of two millions from this tax.

Q.—Are you aware that these things have been considered and thought so unpopular that they have been abandoned ?

A.—Sir J. Strachey said it was unpopular, but still he said it was practicable.

Q.—Do you think that the Government of India is so popular that it can afford to take the risk of adopting any such unpopular measure.

A.—I am glad you asked me the question. I have often persons come to me talking confidentially, because I am not an Englishman, and I believe that leaving out of consideration the same people I spoke of a little while ago, of a million at the top and fifty millions at the bottom, with the balance of the people, the English Government is exceedingly popular.

Q.—This popularity would bear additional taxation.

A.—Upon tobacco it would.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson.—Do you think that missionaries in this country would generally agree with the opinions you have expressed ?

A.—I think they would ; in some details they might differ. We have missions in the Central Provinces and in Southern India. In my earlier years I have come into personal contact with the people. Since I became bishop, I have had more interconrse with the missionaries and most of them have stronger views on the subject than I have.

Mr. Joseph G. Alexander's Evidence.

Q.—*Chairman* :—I suppose you will coneur with me that the arrangement in pursuance of which you are here to-day to give evidence was one which was practically suggested to you by myself on behalf of the Commission. It was not convenient to hold protracted sittings before our early departure for India, and it was difficult to find a day for your evidence in England. I, therefore, suggested that it would be a convenience that you should meet us here and give your evidence in Calcutta ?

A.—That was so.

Q.—I believe you are the Secretary of the Anti-Opium Association ?

A.—Yes. I appeared before the Commission in London, and put in a few documents which I thought might be useful at that stage, reserving further evidence. I need only repeat that I am Secretary of the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade, and have been so nearly four and-a-half years. But I had for many years previously been a member of the Executive Committee of the Society, and taken great interest in its work.

Q.—You are a barrister-at-law ?

A.—Yes, but I have not been in practice since I became Secretary.

Q.—We may take it from you that you have been actively concerned in bringing the case which you wish to present to the consideration of the Committee to-day under the notice of Members of Parliament, and also before the public in England at public meetings, by pamphlets and otherwise ?

A.—That is so.

Q.—I think it is your wish that we should regard the last memorial presented by your Society to Lord Kimberley as containing in brief your case for the suppression of the opium trade ?

A.—That is so. Not strictly the last memorial, but our last general memorial. We have since had occasion to address His Lordship about Burma.

Q.—It would be for the convenience of the Commission and your wish also that we should address you questions which will enable you to submit to the consideration of the Commission the views and arguments put forward in that last general memorial, supported by a greater amount of evidence than you could conveniently incorporate in a formal document. That is so ; is it not ?

No Imputation of Motives.

A.—Yes. But before entering upon the consideration of the points in that document, I should like to take the opportunity of adopting on behalf of the Society the very appropriate words with which your Lordship closed your opening address the other day : "To those engaged in the weighty task of governing this country, I can give a assurance on the part of the Commission that, in common with our fellow countrymen at home, we admire and recognise to the full the admirable qualities for which the Civil Service in India is so justly renowned." Our Society is composed of gentlemen who would be very sorry indeed to take up anything like a hostile position towards the Government of India. We differ from them on this very important question, but we are very anxious not to impute evil motives. We know that men differ on great questions of morality and policy from various circumstances, and it is far from our desire to take up any position which would assume that those who are responsible for the Government of India are not actuated by the highest motives in their desire to fulfil their duty towards the people of India. In support of that I would mention that we have in connection with our Society a number of gentlemen who have spent a good

part of their years in the service of the Government of India. The venerable Sir Arthur Cotton, now more than ninety years of age, is one of our Vice-Presidents and one of our most ardent supporters. I will not simply say that he is proud as he says of what England has done in India, but the way in which he has expressed it to myself and others is that he feels intensely thankful to God for the wonderful providential way in which, as he believes, England has been permitted to discharge its duty towards India. Then we have on our Executive Committee Lieutenant-General Tremenheere, who was for some years Administrator of Sindh, and who was also at one time the Chairman of our Executive Committee; and again Brigade-Surgeon Pringle, who has spent thirty years in the Medical Service of India. We have also two other members of the Committee who have sons in the Indian Civil Service. It will, therefore, be seen that we are not likely to wish to take up any attitude of general hostility to the Government of India. Our attitude is that, admiring that Government, and rejoicing in what it has done for the people of India, we want to remove from it a stigma which we believe rests upon it at the present time in connection with its opium traffic.

THE VOTE OF 1891.

Q.—Turning to the general memorial, I notice that in the first paragraph reference is made to the vote taken in the House of Commons on the tenth of April, 1891, when by a majority of thirty-one votes a resolution was adopted in principle run in as follows:—"This House is of opinion that the system by which the Indian opium revenue is raised is morally indefensible, and would urge upon the Indian Government that they should cease to grant licenses for the cultivation of the poppy and sale of opium in British India, except to supply the legitimate demand for medical purposes, and that they should, at the same time, take measures to arrest the transit of Malwa opium through British territory." Have you any observations to make upon that part of the memorial?

A.—I should like to point out that we have adopted a somewhat careful wording with regard to the action of the House of Commons. The House adopted the resolution "in principle." A good deal has been made of a somewhat technical point owing to the way in which resolutions have to be submitted to the House of Commons. The motion was not an affirmative motion; it was an amendment to the motion to go into the Chair. Sir Robert Fowler had given notice of an amendment dealing with the financial question; and the result was that whilst the vote was taken on the main question, it was technically only a vote not to go into Committee of Supply. At the same time, practically, as Members

of the House of Commons will recognise, it was an adoption of Sir J seph Pease's words. Those words were preferred to the ordinary formal vote submitted in the ordinary course by Government. At that time the rule of the House was to rise at one o'clock. One o'clock had almost arrived, the intervention of a Member for one or two minutes was suffieient to prevent any vote being taken on the amendment submitted by Sir Robert Fowler, and therefore Sir Joseph Pease's resolution never beeame a substantive question, and was not formally adopted and recorded on the Minutes of the House.

Did England Force Opium on China.

Q.—In your second paragraph you allege that the use of opium brings misery to eountless millions in China, and that whereas we in England subject the sale of opium to great restrictions, and it is recognised as you allege by the entire medieal profession as a dangerous poison; on the other hand, in our dealings with China we did in past years endeavour to foree the importation of opium into China by acts of war. You point to the repugnance of the English people to the whole system as being evidenced by resolutions passed at hundreds of public meetings almost always with complete unanimity; and you refer to the large number of petitions which are constantly being presented to Parliament in support of the views of the Anti-Opium Assoeiation. I think that that is a fair summary of your second paragraph. Have you anything that you wish to say to us further with referenee to the wars by whieh in your view the legalisation of the traffie was wrung from China? I need searcely point out that those wars are now rather old history, and you will recognise that the attitude of the Government is substantially changed, as is elearly proved by the speeeh of Sir James Fergusson, so often referred to, and by the speeches of Mr. Smith, Lord Cross and other representative public men.

A.—With regard to that question of the wars, I should have been disposed to say exeeedingly little, looking upon them as past transactions, had it not been for the evidenee produced before the Commission in London. As the members of the Commission in London will remember, we had three gentlemen, Sir Thomas Wade, Mr. Lay and Dr. Lockhart, all alleging that England never forced the opium trade upon China. It seems to me that one can hardly allow sueh an allegation as that to pass unchallenged, beeause, as we put it here, the fact of those wars, and the fact that as we believe opium was by those wars forced upon China, impose upon the British nation a greater degree of respon-

sibility for this trade than it would have had if China had from the beginning voluntarily accepted the trade. I am afraid, therefore, that I shall have to trouble the Commission with some attempt to show that the statements of Sir Thomas Wade, Mr. Lay and Dr. Lockhart are really not well founded. In the first instance I should like to refer to a pamphlet "The Opium Question at the Society of Arts," by my predecessor, the first Secretary of our Society, Mr. Storrs Turner. As I told the Commission in London, he was very ill at that time, and was unable to give evidence. In one portion of that pamphlet he has dealt very carefully with this question. It was written in connection with the debate at the Society of Arts meeting last year, when Sir Thomas Wade made a speech very much to the same effect as the evidence he gave before the Commission. Mr. Lay not only made these statements, but he handed in a note on the opium question and a brief survey of our relations with China, in which he endeavours to make out that the wars were not waged in any sense in support of the opium traffic. I have gone throughout that note very carefully. I should be very sorry, as I have said, to impute motives, and I do not wish to suggest that Mr. Lay had any desire to mislead, but it seems to me that he has written under such extreme bias that he has presented a most unfair and one sided view of the question. I think perhaps it would be more satisfactory if instead of attempting to reply in detail, I should go through the history briefly, and put forward my own view and the view of the Society on the question.

Q.—That would be the more convenient course.

A.—I have here a book which may be looked upon as an authoritative history of China, "The Middle Kingdom," which I believe is adopted officially by the diplomatic service in China as a text-book of Chinese history and Chinese questions generally, to be studied by gentlemen belonging to that service. It is written by Dr. S. Wells Williams, who was I believe, at one time a missionary in China and who is an American, not an Englishman, so that he may be supposed to look at the question from an impartial and outside point of view as between England and China.

The Origin of the Trade.

The early history of the opium trade is best told in Dr. Edkins' pamphlet which has been already put before the Commission and will be printed as an Appendix; but I think that Dr. Edkins, who has brought forward a great deal of new and most interesting information from the early records of China, has omitted one point which Dr. Williams here refers to. Dr. Williams says, "The use of

opium amongst the Chinese two centuries ago must have been very little, or the writings of Romish missionaries from 1580 down to the beginning of the nineteenth century would certainly have contained some account of it." Dr. Dudgeon, of Pekin, another very high authority on Chinese questions, says; "the absence of any reference by the Jesuit missionaries who resided in all parts of the country to either opium-smoking or poppy cultivation is very remarkable. All other sources of information are equally reticent, whether it be travellers, diplomatic agents or missionaries. Barrow and Staunton, who describe China most minutely and correctly in their visit in 1793, only remark that many of the higher mandarins smoke tobacco with other odorous substances, and sometimes a little opium." There is also a book containing a description of Lord Macartney's mission, which travelled through a considerable district of China to Pekin, and had a botanical gentleman attached to it. It contains a careful and accurate notice of the plants met with, but it has no mention whatever of the poppy as having been grown, that is at the end of the last century. Dr. Dudgeon has also pointed out that some of the earlier extracts given by Dr. Edkins refer only to the medicinal use, and not to what one may call, by way of distinction, the sensual use, and that the decree of 1729, which was for the first time brought to light by Dr. Edkins, and which was

THE FIRST CHINESE DECREE AGAINST OPIUM,

was not a general decree applying to the whole country, but simply to the island of Formosa, where apparently the opium-smoking habit was first known in China. A few years later, as I am informed by Dr. Dudgeon, there was a decree generalising that, because it was found that the use of opium-smoking had spread to the mainland. Then I pass to

THE POSITION WHICH LED UP TO THE OPIUM WAR.

Dr. Williams states in his chapter on the origin of the first war with England how that arose out of the ceasing of the East India Company's commercial privileges in 1834; and he deals with the mission of Lord Napier which followed that change. He comments upon Lord Napier's ill advised attempt to set aside the rules of the Chinese Government, which ended in a somewhat tragic way by his death before the question was at all settled. At page 478 he sums up the position just before the war: "The peculiar position of the relations with the Chinese and the value of the trade, present and prospective, was so great that these events called out many pamphleteers both in England and the East.

The servants of the Company naturally recommended a continuance of a peaceable system, urging that foreigners should obey the laws of the Empire where they live, and not interfere with the restrictions put upon them." A little lower down he quotes what was said by the Duke of Wellington, "That which we now require is not to lose the enjoyment of what we have got," and his advice, he says, "was followed in most respects." It was a fairly satisfactory trade, although the English traders were very anxious to have greater openings for their commerce than through the single channel of Canton. Then, speaking of the diplomatic relations between the two countries, he says, "While the point of supremacy seemed to be settled in favour of the Son of Heaven, the virus of the contraband opium trade was working out its evil effects among his subjects and hastening on a new era." I now quote a despatch from Sir G. B. Robinson, who succeeded Lord Napier as Superintendent of the British trade: "On the question of smuggling opium I will not enter in this place, though, indeed, smuggling carried on actively in the Government boats can hardly be termed such. Whenever His Majesty's Government directs us to prevent British vessels engaging in the traffic, we can enforce any order to that effect, but a more certain method would be to prohibit the growth of the poppy and the manufacture of opium in British India; and if British ships are in the habit of committing irregularities and crimes, it seems doubly necessary to exercise a salutary control over them by the presence of an authority at Lintin."

Was China Sincere?

Dr. Williams, commenting on that despatch, says, "There is not the least evidence to show that the Court of Pekin was not sincere in its desire to suppress the trade from the first edict of 1800 till the war broke out in 1840. The excuse that the Government smuggled because its revenue cruisers engaged in it and the helpless provincial authorities winked at it, is no more satisfactory than to make the successful bribery of custom-house officers in England or elsewhere a proof of the corruption of the treasury department." I might apply that argument in India. When I was passing through the Central Provinces, I was told some stories about smuggling from the Native States said to be carried on with the connivance of the English Government Police. I think it would be just as appropriate to say that the Indian Government is not sincere in its desire to suppress the smuggling of opium into its territories because some of its police officers are, or are said to be, bribed, as to say that the Chinese Government were not sincere because some of its officers were bribed. I therefore strongly object to the phrase, which was quoted by Sir

Thomas Wade or Mr. Lay with approval, that it was not properly to be called smuggling because there was so much official connivance with it. Then Dr. Williams goes on to recount a remarkable proposal made to legalise the opium trade by Hu Nai Tsi. Some quotations were made from his memorial in the evidence which was put forward in London, as if those were the views of men who did not recognise the evils of the trade. I think to any one who reads through those memorials it is clear that these men did recognise the great evils of the trade, only they thought it was hopeless to attempt to stop it, and it was better to legalise it. But those memorials were replied to by statesmen on the other side. One of them says, "It has been represented that advantage is taken of the laws against opium by extortionate underlings and worthless vagrants to benefit themselves. Is it not known, then, that when Government enacts a law, there is necessarily an infraction of that law? And though the law should sometimes be relaxed and become ineffectual, yet surely it should not on that account be abolished, any more than we should altogether cease to eat because of stoppage of the throat. The laws which forbid the people to do wrong may be likened to the dykes which prevent the overflowing of water. If any one urging then that the dykes are very old and therefore useless we should have them thrown down, what words could express the consequences of the impetuous rush and all-destroying overflow." I venture to think that these arguments may have some application in India at the present day as they had in China then. The result was that the Court of Pekin decided not to legalise. Meanwhile Captain Elliott had expressed himself in despatches home as confident that legalisation was about to take place. The contrary actually took place. Two of these memorials suggest that the purpose of the English in introducing opium into the country has been to weaken and enfeeble it. That was in the memorial of Chu Tsun. A Sub-Censor supported him, and in the abstract of that memorial Dr. Williams says: "The Sub-Censor agrees with Chu Tsun regarding the designs of foreigners in doing so, that they wished first to debilitate and impoverish the land as a preparatory measure, for they never smoked the drug in their own country, but brought it all to China." It is interesting to compare those views expressed more than half a century ago with the evidence given by several missionaries that a precisely similar impression is at present largely prevailing in China, and that among some of the best classes in China it is said that England purposely introduces opium into China in order to weaken and debilitate the Chinese nation, so that they may ultimately conquer the country. Of course

we know that it is not so, but we can understand how such a view has arisen. Then Dr. Williams again refers to the question of sincerity. He says, "It is unjust to the Chinese to say, as was argued by those who had never felt these sufferings, that all parties were insincere in their efforts to put down this trade, that it was a mere affectation of morality, and that no one would be more chagrined to see it stop than those apparently so strenuous against it. This assertion was made by Lord Palmerston in Parliament, and re-echoed by the Indian officials ; but those who have candidly examined the proceedings of the Chinese, or have lived among the people in a way to learn their real feelings, need not be told how incorrect is the remark. The highest statesman and the debilitated victimed smoker are alike agreed in their opinion of its bad effects, and both were pretty much in the position of a miserable lamb in the coil of a hungry anaconda." (That is a very favourite metaphor with the Chinese on the subject of opium. A friend shewed me not long ago a little model which he had received from some missionary friends in China representing the opium wretch in that way. It was not an anaconda, but it was a cuttle-fish or octopus destroying the man.)

Commissioner Lin Sent to Stop the Trade.

As is well known, the result was that the Emperor sent down to Canton, Commissioner Lin in order to put a stop to the trade. Before Commissioner Lin arrived some measures had been taken. Dr. Williams says : "There can be no reasonable doubt that the best part of his people and the moral power of the nation were with their sovereign in this attempt. Hu Nai Tsi was dismissed for proposing legalisation, and three princes of the blood degraded for smoking opium ; arrests, fines, tortures, imprisonments, and executions were frequent in the provinces on the same grounds, all showing the determination to eradicate it. The Governor of Hukwang, Lin Tseh-su, was ordered to proceed to Canton, with unlimited powers to stop the traffic. The trade there was at this time almost suspended, the deliveries being small and at losing prices. Many underlings were convicted and summarily punished, and on February 26th Fung A-ngan was strangled in front of the factories for his connection with opium and participation in the affray at Whampoa. The foreign flags, English, American, Dutch, and French, were all hauled down in consequence. The entire stoppage of all trade was threatened, and the Governor urged foreigners to send all opium ships from Chinese waters, Commissioner Lin arrived in Canton, March 10th. The Emperor sent him to inquire and act so as thoroughly to remove the source of the evil, for, says he, ' if the source of the evil be not clearly ascertained, how can we hope that the

stream of pernicious consequences shall be stayed? It is our full hope that the long indulged habit will be for ever laid aside, and every root and germ of it entirely eradicated; we would fain think that our ministers will be unable to substantiate our wishes, and so remove from China dire calamity.' It was reported in Canton that the monarch when recounting the evils which had long afflicted his people by means of opium, paused and wept, and turning to Lin said: 'How, alas, can I die and go to the shades of my imperial fathers and ancestors, until these direful evils are removed?' Such was the chief purpose of this movement on the part of the Chinese Government, and Lin was invested with the fullest powers ever conferred on a subject. Although long experience of the ineffectiveness of Chinese edicts generally lead those residing in the country to regard them as mere verbiage, still to say that they are all insincere and formal because they are ineffectual is to misjudge and pervert the emotions of common humanity." The following events are such well- known history that I need not dwell upon them. It is well-known that the Chinese Government obtained possession of the opium by imprisoning the British merchants in their houses (you have had before you Mr. Donald Matheson, one of the merchants imprisoned), and the opium was all destroyed. Dr. Williams states that the market value of the 20,283 chests of opium destroyed at the time was not far from nine million dollars, and the cost price nearly eleven millions.

The Opium War.

War ensued; and here Dr. Williams quotes the language used by Lord John Russell. "The bonds were not made a pretext for war by the English ministry; that, on the part of England, according to Lord John Russell, was 'set on foot to obtain reparation for insults and injuries offered Her Majesty's Superintendent and subjects; to obtain indemnification for the losses the merchants had sustained under threats of violence; and lastly to get security that persons and property trading with China should in future be protected from insult and injury, and trade maintained upon a proper footing.'"

The cause of the War.

Now I stop here to point out what seems to me to be the vice of the argument of Sir Thomas Wade and Mr. Lay. Undoubtedly, as is fully admitted by Mr. Turner in his pamphlet, there were other causes leading to the war in addition to the seizure of opium; and it seems to me that Mr. Lay and Sir Thomas Wade have simply set aside this one cause and have taken those other subsidiary and collateral causes

and said that they were the only reasons of the war. It does not seem to me that you can logically adopt that course.

Q.—I think Sir Thomas Wade urged that the exclusiveness of the Chinese, their unwillingness to enter into relations with other powers, treating us as barbarians only to be approached through the Hong Kong merchants, were a natural and inevitable cause of misunderstanding. He urged that if the Chinese authorities had been willing to enter into direct communication with us, explanations would have been exchanged which would probably have averted the ultimate warlike proceedings which we all regret ?

A.—No doubt that was the substance of his argument. Dr. Williams combats that by pointing out that on previous occasions concessions had been obtained from China without force ; and if China had been treated in a proper way, these concessions might have been obtained. But at all events, as he says, the war did, as a matter of fact, grow out of the trade ; and Sir Thomas Wade himself admits that it may properly be called the Opium War. Dr. Williams says : "The war was looked upon in this light by the Chinese, and it will also be so looked upon by candid historian, and known as the Opium war." Dr. Williams also refers to the debate which took place in Parliament. Of course it was not admitted in that debate by Lord Macaulay, who was the Government spokeman, that opium was the object of the war ; nor was it by Sir George Staunton, who took an independent position in the debate, and whose authority, from his great knowledge of China, was very great. He defended the war, but spoke in the strongest terms against the opium-smuggling trade. But I venture to think that the speech made by Mr. Gladstone already quoted by Sir Joseph Pease, truly states the case, that while there had been no doubt many things on the part of the Chinese which were objectionable, yet in the main the Chinese were right and we were wrong. Lord Melbourne in the course of the debate said, "We possess immense territories peculiarly fitted for raising opium, and though I would wish that the Government were not so directly concerned in the traffic, I am not prepared to pledge myself to relinquish it." Dr. Williams remarks : "This debate was in fact a remarkable instance of the way in which a moral question is blinked even by conscientious persons whenever politics or interest come athwart its course." He also refers to two letters written by Commissioner Lin to Queen Victoria desiring her assistance in putting down the opium trade. One of those letters has been recently published. I should like to hand in to the Commission a publication of ours, "A Chinese Statesman on the Opium

Traffic." It begins with one of these letters, and the other letter will be found in Mr. Storrs Turner's book, "British Opium Policy," The note on the first page is incorrect in the supposition that these were different translations of the same letter. Mr. Lay has already pointed out that they were two different letters. In dealing with the conduct of the war, on two or three occasions Dr. Williams points out that negotiations which were begun with the object of stopping the war failed mainly because of the determination of the Chinese to resist rather than to grant full idemnity for the opium.

The Treaty of Nanking.

As we all know, the Chinese were defeated and ultimately had to yield. One of the conditions of the treaty was that a large sum, I think six million dollars, was to be paid by China as compensation for the opium that was destroyed, that opium having been contraband. Then, after the treaty, at the final interview between Sir Henry Pottinger and the Chinese Commissioners, there was a remarkable conversation of which Dr. Williams gives an account taken from Captain Loch's "Events in China": "When matters connected with the treaty had been arranged, Sir Henry proposed to say a few words upon the great cause that produced the disturbances which led to the war, *viz.*, the trade in opium." That is a round-about-way of saying that it was the trade in opium that led to the war. "But upon hearing this (Captain Loch says) they unanimously declined entering upon the subject until they were assured that he had introduced it merely as a topic for private conversation. They then evinced much interest, and eagerly requested to know why we would not act fairly towards them by prohibiting the growth of the poppy in our dominions, and thus effectually stop a traffic so pernicious to the human race. This, he said in consistency with our constitution and laws, could not be done; and he added that, even if England chose to exercise so arbitrary a power over her tillers of the soil, it would not check the evil, so far as the Chinese were concerned, while the cancer remained uneradicated among themselves, but that it would merely throw the market into other hands. It, in fact, he said, rests entirely with yourselves. If your people are virtuous, they will desist from the evil practice; and if your officers are incorruptible and obey your orders, no opium can enter your country. The discouragement of the growth of the poppy in your territories rests principally with you, for nearly the entire produce cultivated in India travels east to China; if, however, the habit has become a confirmed vice, and you feel that your power is at present inadequate to stay its indulgence, you

may rest assured your people will procure the drug in spite of every enactment. Would it not, therefore, be better at once to legalise its importation, and by thus securing the co-operation of the rich and of your authorities, from whom it would thus be no longer debarred, thereby greatly limit the facilities which now exist for smuggling? They owned the plausibility of the argument, but expressed themselves persuaded that their imperial master would never listen to a word upon the subject." Dr. Williams comments severely, as well he may, upon the tone adopted by Sir Henry Pottinger, and his really untruthful statement that there was anything unconstitutional in prohibiting the growth of the poppy, which had already been prohibited in a large area of British India, and upon the melancholy picture of British statesman saying to Chinese statesmen, "Your people must become virtuous and your officers incorruptible, and then you can stop opium coming into your borders." I think it must have been about that time, though I have never been able exactly to ascertain the date, that the Emperor of China used some very memorable words which are reported by Mr. Montgomery Martin. When approached with a view of legalising the trade, the Emperor replied, "It is true that I cannot prevent the introduction of the flowing poison; gain-seeking and corrupt men will, for profit and sensuality, defeat my wishes; but nothing will induce me to derive a revenue from the vice and misery of my people." Sir Edward Fry has pointed out that whilst nothing was said about this opium trade in the treaty, we almost immediately afterwards concluded a treaty with China in which we agreed to put down smuggling. That was really never carried out. A proclamation was issued by Sir Henry Pottinger, which was entirely futile, telling the traders in opium that they carried on the trade at their own cost. Dr. Williams says, "All this was done chiefly to throw dust in their eyes and put the onus of the contraband traffic on the Chinese Government, and the violation of law on those who came off to the smuggling vessels, and these proclamations and orders, like their edicts, were to be put 'on record.' This was shown when Captain Hope of H. M. S. *Thalia*, for stopping two or three of the opium vessels proceeding above Shanghai, was recalled from his station and ordered to India, where he could not 'interfere in such a manner with the undertakings of British subjects;' to quote Lord Palmerston's Despatch to Captain Elliott. This effectually deterred other British officers from meddling with it."

Once more Dr. Williams gives this final summary of the war:—"Public opinion will ever characterise the contest thus brought to an end as an *opium war*, entered into and carried on to obtain indemnity for

opium seized, and setting aside the niceties of western internationnl law, which the Chinese Governmeut knew nothing of, most justly seized. The British and American merchants, who voluntarily subscribed one thousand and thirty-seven chests to Commissioner Lin, acknowledged themselves to be transgressors by this very act." He refers to Mr. Justin MacCarthy's chapter X of the "History of our own Times," and says that his "short and pithy digest brings out the leading features in a fairly candid manner."

Smuggling Continues.

Well, the trade went on as an illegal tradc. Further on, there is a mention of Sir John Davis' attempt to obtain its legalisation and to his conversation with Ki-yug, to which I think I need not refer. Then we come to the second China War. As Mr. Pease stated in London, neither Mr. Turner, my predecessor, nor I have used the expression "the Second Opium War." It has been sometimes so called by advocates on our side, and they have the justification of a letter by Li Hung Chung, in which he speaks of two Opium wars, and which form the second of the documents in the publication I handed in: "A Chinese Statesman on the Opium traffic." At the same time it did not directly arise out of the opium traffic; it was only indirectly connected with it. Dr. Williams has a statement of the position of affairs which I need not read, showing how these lorchas, of which the lorcha "Arrow" was one, were all engaged in this smuggling trade; and that it was in that way the difficulty arose that led to the second war.

Lord Elgin's Views.

Here I turn to another authority, "The Letters and Journals of Lord Elgin," the Ambassador employed to negotiate peace and to settle the difficulties with China. His letters are full of allusions to the strong feeling he has that war was an altogether unjustifiable and unjust war, and brought about by the misconduct of English subjects in the East. Here is one of them under the date of December the 9th, 1837, "I have hardly alluded in my ultimatum to that wretched question of the 'Arrow,' which is a scandal to us, and is so considered, I have reason to know, by all except the few who are personally compromised." In another place he says, "I thought bitterly of those who for the most selfish objects are trampling under foot this ancient civilisation." Again he says, "Two months I have been there engaged in this painful service, checking as I have been best able to do the disposition to maltreat this unfortunate people." Again, there is a reference to a Blue Book issued

by the British Government in order to justify itself, detailing a series of insults to British subjects by Chinese authorities. He met with Mr. Burns, a missionary, a man whose name is very distinguished in missionary records, and he says, "Hearing that Mr. Burns, a missionary, whose case is narrated in the series of 'Insults by the Chinese Authorities' submitted to Parliament (he having been in fact very kindly treated, as he himself acknowledges), was at the island, I invited him to breakfast." That document is referred to by Mr. Lay as one of those which support his view. Then he sums up, "No doubt, as you say, one cannot help sometimes regretting that one is mixed up with so bad a business as this in China, but then in some respects it is a great opportunity for doing good or at least for mitigating evil." May I be permitted, though it is perhaps irrelevant, to say that those extracts and others which I could have read show how great and noble was the character of Lord Elgin, how supremely he desired that justice should be done to races which had been proved to be weaker in war than the English race, and how one cannot help rejoicing in the confident hope that his son who is so shortly to arrive in India will prove to be a man imbued with similar sentiments. Lord Elgin, went from China to Japan. There he signed the treaty which first opened Japan to our commerce, a treaty which had not been forced by war, and a treaty which absolutely prohibited the opium trade, a prohibition which has been strictly enforced by the Japanese ever since. The Japanese are well aware of the vice which is bringing such terrible evils upon their neighbours in China; therefore they have always shown themselves on the alert to prevent its introduction into their own country. I heard a missionary who had resided some years in Japan tell how very severely some men were treated who were once caught attempting to smuggle opium into Japan.

The Treaty of Tientsin.

In the peace Lord Elgin did not deem it consistent with his duty to make the legalisation of the opium traffic one of the terms of treaty. I have dealt with that subject in a letter to the *Times* a few years ago, and if I read it, it will perhaps be better than attempting to go over the ground afresh—

"It may be well in the first place to observe that our present agitation is merely based, not on the assumption that China is being still forced to admit Indian opium, but on what appears to us to be the immorality of the Indian Government in producing, for the purpose of sale to China, a drug which causes such widespread demoralisation in the

latter country. The question raised by Mr. Lay is, therefore more a historical than a practical one. At the same time it undoubtedly adds immensely to the responsibility of Great Britain if, as we are convinced, the action of our Government in the past has been such to as overbear the genuine objection formerly entertained by the Chinese Government to the admission of opium, and has brought about her present apparent acquiescence in its import. If Mr. Lay simply means that China has never been compelled, as the condition *sine qua non* of a cessation from armed force, to place opium in the category of imports permitted to be brought into the treaty ports, we must admit his correctness. But we maintain that the legalisation of the opium trade was really and truly the result of the cruel and unjust wars of 1840 and 1856, and of the powerful moral support continuously given to opium-smugglers by the British Government before the first war and in the interval between it and the second. As to the Opium War of 1840, it is needless to defend, even against Mr. Lay, the general verdict of history. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* It was unquestionably one of the conditions of the treaty of Nanking, which brought the war to a close, that compensation should be made by China for the value of the opium destroyed by Commissioner Lin ; and this fact speaks for itself. As regards the tariff supplement to the treaty of Tientsin, with which Mr. Lay was personally connected, and by which opium was first recognised as a lawful article of commerce, it is to be remembered that the treaty itself was the result of violent coercion. Lord Elgin says of the negotiations ('Letters and Journals page 253,) 'We went on fighting and bullying and getting the poor Commissioners to concede one point after another.' One of the 'chief articles' of the treaty thus concluded was, as stated by his biographer, 'the tariff fixed by the Treaty of Nanking to be revised.' If the treaty itself was obtained by force, how can it be said that the insertion of a fresh item in the revised tariff for which that treaty provided was purely voluntary ?

"With regard to the circumstances under which opium was inserted in the tariff supplement, they are fully stated in the 'Report on the Revision of Tariff,' etc., furnished by Messrs. Oliphant and Wade, the deputies appointed by Lord Elgin to act on his behalf, which is annexed to Lord Elgin's despatch to the Earl of Malmesbury, dated Shanghai, October 22, 1858. They show that on October 12th the deputies (with whom Mr. Lay was associated by Lord Elgin's request) had a preliminary conference with the Chinese Commissioners, at which, by request of the latter, they furnished the Chinese with a list of subjects for discussion,,

No. 7 being 'legalisation of opium under duties.' It appears further that on this occasion it was urged by the British deputies that opium was an article which 'no laws were found to exclude, and the irregularity of the present trade in which was highly objectionable.' The following day another conference was held, when, for reasons not necessary to be here stated, the British deputies desired, and the Chinese Commissioners consented, to proceed with opium as the very first subject of discussion. One of the Chinese Commissioners, 'whose position as Superintendent of Customs at Shanghai,' says the report, 'naturally gives him a chief voice in such matters, admitted the necessity of a change. China still retains her objection to the use of a drug on moral grounds; but the present generation of smokers, at all events, must and will have opium. China would propose a very high duty, but, as opposition was naturally to be expected from us in that case, it should be as moderate as possible.' He proceeded to urge that opium should be treated quite differently from other articles of import, and, 'after much discussion' as to the rate of duty, the British first naming fifteen to twenty taels and the Chinese sixty taels per chest, it was finally fixed at thirty taels. Reviewing the whole transaction, it appears clear that Sir Rutherford Alcock was substantially justified in telling the East India Finance Committee of 1871. 'We have forced the Chinese Government to enter into a treaty to allow their subjects to take opium.'"

Dr. Legge, who gave evidence before the Commission in London and who is one of the greatest authorities in England or Europe on Chinese questions, in a letter to the *Times*, which was not published in that paper, but appeared in the *Friend of China*, wrote; "The instructions issued to Lord Elgin from the Foreign Office (April 20th, 1857) directed him when discussing commercial arrangements with any Chinese plenipotentiaries to ascertain whether the Government of China would revoke its prohibition of the opium trade, for there would be obvious advantages in placing the trade on a legal footing by the imposition of a duty instead of its being carried on in the present irregular manner. Various expressions in Lord Elgin's diary show that, as a whole, his mission was not very agreeable to him; to procure the legalisation of the opium trade was especially disagreeable. How he got over the feeling, and yet we find no reference to opium in the articles of the Treaty, appears in a letter of the 19th October, written to Mr. Reed, the American plenipotentiary: 'When I resolved,' he says, 'not to press the matter on the Chinese Commissioners at Tientsin, I did so, not because I questioned the advantages that would arise from

the legalisation of the traffic, but because I could not reconcile it to my sense of right to urge the Imperial Government to abandon its traditional policy in this respect under the kind of pressure which we were bringing to bear upon it at Tientsin. He then speaks of the circumstances under which the question was to come up for discussion in the approaching Conference on the subject of the tariff being 'happily different.' So he was able to satisfy his 'sense of right' in fulfilling his mission by a delusion of the mind. The Conference on the tariff was a natural sequence to the discussions with the Commissioners at Tientsin. And the officers appointed by them to conclude the arrangements must have well known that they dared only to discuss and accede to the wishes of *his* officers, with any slight modification favourable to themselves which they might well be able to secure." Further down Dr. Legge says: "In this way the import of opium at the ports of China opened to foreign commerce was legalised. To say the legalisation was not 'in opposition to the will and in defiance to the remonstrances of the Chinese Imperial Government,' is not, to use your own language, 'according to the real facts of the case.' It was compulsion, the consequence of coercion, of which no one has written so strongly as Lord Elgin himself did. Some of his expressions about it cannot be read without extreme pain. I do not think it material to refer at length to the subsequent war of 1860. It will be remembered that the Chinese Government did not ratify that treaty, under circumstances which laid them open to the imputation of bad faith. That is a question the rights and wrongs of which Dr. Williams fully discusses. The consequence was that we went to war again. Lord Elgin was sent to China a second time. It was after the burning of the Summer Palace that the Chinese finally gave way, and the treaty was ultimately ratified.

Q.—Does that conclude what you have to say with reference to the war?

A.—I will quote three opinions on the matter from very high authorities, and that will conclude what I have to say on that point. The first is the evidence of Sir Rutherford Alcock (Sir Thomas Wade's predecessor as British Ambassador in China) before the Indian Finance Committee in 1871.

"Q.—Now, is there anything in our treaties to force them to take our opium?

"A.—Yes, it is put in the tariff of articles of import.

"Q.—Then they are bound to allow the free import of opium?

"A.—That was the condition introduced into the treaty which Lord Elgin made.

"Q.—But we do not enforce the purchase ?

"A.—Not the purchase ; but they cannot prohibit the import of opium ; it is amongst the admitted articles on the tariff.

"Q.—Then, notwithstanding the Chinese Government are so sensible of the demoralization of their people caused by the import of opium, they cannot prevent our sending it there : we force them by treaty to take it from us ?

"A.—That is so in effect.

"Q.—We have forced the Government to enter into a treaty to allow their subjects to take it.

"A.—Yes, precisely.

"Q.—Is it any wonder that the Chinese Government complain of our conduct in that respect ?

"A.—No, I do not think it is any wonder.

"Q.—What should we say if these Chinese imposed the like restrictions upon us ?

"A.—I think that our answer to them for putting it into the treaty is : 'You cannot prevent it being smuggled, and the lesser evil is to admit it as a legitimate article of trade.'

"Q.—But is it not for them to judge of that, and not for us ?

"A.—No doubt, if two nations are negotiating together on equal terms, each should have a voice.

"Q.—But suppose the Chinese Government were to say, 'We decline to admit opium ; we will not renew the treaty except on the condition of excluding opium altogether ?'

"A.—I think they could only do that on the same principle as that on which Prince Gortschakoff declared that Russia would not submit to the continued neutralisation of the Black Sea,—they must be prepared to fight for it.

"Q.—As I understand you, you say that the Chinese have made a treaty from which it is not possible for them to escape ?

"A.—It is not possible for them to escape from it, except by a declaration that they will not submit to what they conceive to be injurious terms.

"Q.—The only way that they can escape from it is by a war ?

"A.—A war, or a declaration that they are ready to go to war rather than submit any longer."

Sir Thomas Wade, speaking about all that we have obtained from China, said: "Nothing that has been gained, it must be remembered, was received from the free will of the Chinese; more, the concessions made to us have been, from first to last, extorted against the conscience of the nation, in defiance, that is to say, of the moral convictions of its educated men, not merely of the office-holders, whom we call mandarins, and who are numerically but a small proportion of the educated class, but of the nucleus who are saturated with a knowledge of the history and philosophy of that country." That was written by Sir Thomas Wade in a memorandum by him contained in a Blue Book presented to Parliament in 1871. Once more, here are the words of Lord Elgin himself in a despatch printed in a Blue Book of 1871: "The concessions obtained in the treaty from the Chinese Government are not in themselves extravagant, but in the eyes of the Chinese Government they amount to a revolution. They have been extorted therefore from its fears."

Q.—That concludes the statement you wish to make with reference to the wars in China?

A.—Yes.

The Effects of the Opium Trade on China.

Q.—Before we adjourn, it will be well to complete your examination with reference to the second paragraph of your memorial. It is alleged in the paragraph that the opium traffic brings misery to countless myriads in China. Have you anything to say in support of that view?

A.—I have prepared an abstract of evidence in support of that statement; but I will simply go over a few heads. First we have the evidence of

Protestant Missionaries, of whom seventeen appeared before the Commission in London—I include Dr. Lockhart, who concurred with our witnesses as to the evil effects on China. You had also the Secretaries of two important Missionary Societies, who personally had no experience in China, but who represented two large bodies of Missionaries, those of the Church Missionary Society and the China Inland Mission. To which I may add that all the English societies labouring in China and one or two Scotch societies joined in a deputation to Lord Kimberley a year ago in support of our views. There was also a practically unanimous missionary petition presented to the House of Commons in 1883, and there have been on two or three occasions unanimous resolu-

tions by Missionary Conferences in China representing the whole Protestant Missionary body. So that we have before the Commission the unanimous testimony of the whole Protestant Missionary body, including the medical missionaries, labouring in China.

Roman Catholic Missionaries are no less unanimous on this point. I have an official document from the Court of Rome on the question. The Bishop and Vicars-Apostolic of Western China met in 1880, and there was some difference among them as to whether the use of opium in any form was to be absolutely prohibitary to reception into the Roman Catholic Church by baptism. The answer, of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith with which I have been favoured by Cardinal Vaughan, bears date last year only. Referring to previous papal decrees on the subject, it lays down the absolute rule that with the exception of such necessary indulgence as there may be for those who need medical treatment, that the use of opium in any form is to be considered absolutely prohibited to Roman Catholics in China, its growth, and any share whatever in the traffic. So that the Roman Catholic Church, owing to the representations of its missionaries in China, is just as clear on the subject as the Protestant missionaries are. Then we have

Some British Merchants in China, Mr. Donald Matheson, who apeared before the Commission in London, and Mr. Hanbury, who was with us at the deputation to Lord Kimberley, and who has traded many years in China. He has always refused to have anything to do with the opium trade. He has given strict orders that no portion of his large property at Shanghai is to be let to opium dealers. Then we have a considerable number of

British Officials connected with China. I have already referred to Sir George Staunton. I have also quotations from Mr. Montgomery Martin, who was Treasurer of Hong Kong, Mr. Lay, British Consul at Amoy, (who used a very strong expression, speaking of it as "hamstringing the nation"), Mr. Majoribanks, Sir John Pope Hennessy, Governor of Hongkong (who spoke in the strongest words of the way in which the Chinese authorities had constantly remonstrated with him against the trade, not so much on physical grounds as on account of the moral effects of opium-taking), Sir Rutherford Alcock, and Sir Thomas Wade himself. Then I ought perhaps also to refer to an interesting and curious book, which has lately come out, by an opium-smuggler, in which, although he was engaged in the smuggling of opium, he admits the great evil it is. As to

The Chinese, Mr. Hanbury, at the deputation to Lord Kimberley, said :—Produce to me ten or even five Chinamen who will say that opium smoking is innocuous." No Chinaman has ever come forward publicly to declare that he defends the trade. We have seen that some of them were in favour of legalisation as being a better thing than smuggling ; but so far as I know, no Chinaman has ever said that the trade did not do a great evil in his country. There are a great many statements of Chinese statesmen and others to be referred to on that head.

The Counter-evidence is only that of some merchants, some travellers and some officials.

The Value of Official Opium.

With regard to officials, some important words were pronounced by Mr. Gladstone in his speech in the recent debate : " I do not think that in this matter we ought to be guided exclusively, perhaps even principally, by those who may consider themselves experts. It is a very sad thing to say, but unquestionably it happens not infrequently in human affairs, that those who ought, from their situation to know the most and best, yet from prejudice and prepossessions know the least and the worst. Eminently it was the case in the great question of West Indian slavery, when this House and the country for a long time were discouraged and abashed by the assurance that those who were in favour of that great and radical change were in favour of it only because they did not understand the Negro character. There may be something of that element in this case. I certainly, for my part, do not propose to abide finally and decisively by official opinion. Independent opinion,—independent, but responsible—is what the House wants, in my opinion, in order to enable it to proceed safely in the career upon which, I admit, that it has definitely entered." That seems to me to be a very strong case, and bearing a remarkable analogy to the present case. My acquaintance with the anti-slavery literature of the past generation leads me to believe that the West Indian officials were unanimous in the view that the institution of slavery was desirable, but they have been proved by the public conscience of Great Britain and the experience of mankind since to have been wrong.

Public Opinion at Home.

Q.—Referring to the evidence that you have with regard to public opinion at home, is there anything you wish to bring before us in support of your statement that the resolutions you propose are received with almost absolute unanimity at hundreds of meetings; and have you anything to say with reference to the number and influential position of those who sign the numerous petitions that are presented to Parliament ?

A.—I have taken a considerable share in the public meetings that have been held on this question since I became Secretary, rather more than four years ago,—latterly not so much as during the first year or two. One thing that has struck me very much is the way in which at these meetings different classes of opinion have been represented. One of the most important meetings that I attended shortly after becoming Secretary was a breakfast meeting held at Leeds. The remark was made to me afterwards by a gentleman long acquainted with Leeds that he did not believe that on any other subject such a meeting could have been gathered. We had representatives of all the different classes of thought into which English opinion is divided. Religiously we had Church of England people and Nonconformists, High Church and Low Church; politically we had Tories and Radicals; and altogether it was a meeting that I was told was probably in Leeds unprecedented. What I have said of that meeting applies generally and to a very large degree to a great many other meetings that we have held throughout the country. Where the unanimity has been broken, it has I think, always been only by those directly connected with India and with the services in India. We have always been accustomed to give the fullest opportunity to gentlemen who wished to oppose the views we put forward. They have, no doubt, sometimes been listened to with impatience by the audience opposed to them. But at all events they have been fully and fairly heard on many occasions, and they have never succeeded in turning any votes. The largest minority that I am aware of anywhere was a minority of 3, all directly connected with Indian official life. Petitions to Parliament have been very much to the same effect. According to the latest return I have, up to the 10th July last, 2,470 petitions were presented during the session, including 329 officially signed; the total signatures being 205,563.

Printed by
Joseph Culshaw, Methodist Publishing House, Calcutta.

am.
Drugs
Opium

797

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part III. 21st November, 1893.

PRICE ONE PENNY, or ONE ANNA, for each daily part.

Published by the
Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade,
Broadway Chambers, London, S. W.
Also at the
Methodist Publishing House, 45, Dharamtala St., Calcutta.

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Mr. J. G. Alexander's Evidence, Continued.

Q.—*Chairman.*—After your examination yesterday the subject was discussed by the members of the Commission, and it was decided that it was not necessary to take any detailed evidence with reference to matters so long since passed as these to which your statements chiefly referred. We therefore do not propose to cross-examine you upon the history of our wars and conflicts with China. In the third paragraph of your memorial presented to Lord Kimberley you express the desire that the area under poppy cultivation in the Behar and Benares Agency should at once be restricted, and you urge in support of that prayer that declarations in that sense had been made in Parliament by Sir James Fergusson and the late Right Hon'ble W. H. Smith ?

A.—I think it is hardly correct to say that it is our prayer that they should be restricted. This paragraph refers to the measures that were actually taken, or that we understood to have been taken, by the late Government. The credit given to the late Government for what had been done must be modified in view of Sir David Barbour's statement the other day, that the Indian Government has not yet adopted any new policy in the sense we had understood. But with regard to that I have further to call attention to an express statement by Mr. George Curzon, in reply to a question from Sir Joseph Pease, on the 25th February 1892, founded upon those statements of Sir James Fergusson and Mr. Smith a year before. Mr. Curzon in his reply stated :—" The figures for 1891-92 have not yet been received, but in order to restrict the area of cultivation the Government of India reduced the number of chests for sale in the year from 57,000 to 54,000." We took that as an express declaration that the Government of India were acting upon the policy that had been announced in the House of Commons in 1891.

Q.—Do you desire to express yourself as satisfied with the declarations that have been made by the representatives of the Government so far as they went ?

A.—We considered those declarations to mark decided progress from our point of view.

54'000 chests a year.

Q.—Do you now desire to say that the indications that have been given in Sir David Barbour's evidence have been received by you with a certain amount of regret ?

A.—Regret and surprise, because we had been given to understand that the Government of India was carrying out the views expressed by Sir James Fergusson and Mr. Smith.

Q.—Have you anything further to say with reference to this question of acreage under poppy cultivation ?

A.—Perhaps this will be the best place for me to say that, from our point of view, a gradual diminution of this kind cannot really be satisfactory ; it does not meet our main objection which is, that the trade is altogether an immoral one ; and if it is an immoral trade obviously it ought to be stopped at once, and no question of gradual diminution can arise. But there is another point of view, apart from what I may call the moral point, from which we may look at the question—that is, the point of view of practical philanthropy—the practical wish to put a stop to the consumption of opium in the East, and especially in China. For myself,—I do not venture here to speak as representing all the members of our society ; I do not know whether they would all follow me ; but for myself I should be willing somewhat to lay aside the urgency of the high moral point of view, namely, that the trade is immoral, and should therefore at once and altogether be suppressed, if I could feel sure that by another course we should more speedily arrive at the real practical philanthropic object that we have in the stoppage of the consumption of opium in China. I think Sir George Staunton in the debate in 1840 made the declaration that this trade could never be stopped except by a consensus of the Chinese and British Governments ; and, holding that he was right in that view, I should be satisfied to waive something of our claim that the trade must be immediately and absolutely suppressed, in order to obtain, from the Chinese Government some concurrent action which would promise a more speedy end of this great evil. My objection to gradual diminution on the lines laid down by the Government in 1891 and which we supposed the Indian Government had been adopting, is that practically it makes no difference to China. So long as there is no agreement with the Chinese Government that it will reciprocate those measures the practical effect simply is that so many thousand chests are produced in China instead of in India. I believe that the Indian opium is more injurious and deleterious than native grown opium, and from that point of view there perhaps may be some improvement ; but otherwise, as long as the British Government has

no agreement with the Chinese Government that it will carry out the same policy in China, a gradual diminution does nothing whatever to put an end to the great evil that we are combating. That is why we consider any policy of gradual diminution without a distinct agreement with the Chinese Government to be a wholly unsatisfactory one.

Q.—Have you any reason to suppose that the Chinese Government is at the present time anxious to come to an agreement with the Government of India for the total prohibition of the use of opium? Has it not been represented to those who have recently been negotiating on the part of the British Government, that the Chinese Government are of opinion that if they were to totally prohibit importation, the demand could be met by a local supply, and that having that in view, they thought it would rather be a question of checking the consumption of opium by taxation, and that it was impossible to entertain at present a policy of total prohibition. Was not that represented by Sir Thomas Wade in his evidence in London, and is not that view confirmed in the course of negotiation in which the Marquis Tseng was engaged first with Lord Granville and afterwards with Lord Salisbury for modifications of the Chefoo Convention?

A.—In 1869 the Tsung-Li-Yamen (Foreign Board) of China addressed to the British Government through Sir Rutherford Alcock a memorial in which they said: "The writers hope that His Excellency will memorialize his Government to give orders in India and elsewhere to substitute the cultivation of cereals or cotton. Were both nations to rigorously prohibit the growth of the poppy, both the traffic in and the consumption of opium might alike be put an end to." Within the last few years, shortly before the signing of the Additional Article of 1885, a special mission was again sent from China to Calcutta, to propose to the Indian Government a scheme for the gradual suppression of the poppy cultivation in both countries.

Q.—I suppose you mean on the part of the Chinese Government?

A.—On the part of the Chinese Government. Of that mission so far as I am aware no official account has ever been published. Information has reached me through private sources that there was such a mission. I believe that a gentleman employed in the Chinese Customs' service came to Calcutta in order to ascertain whether it would not be possible to come to some such arrangement with the Indian Government.

Q.—For total prohibition?

A.—For gradual suppression in both countries concurrently.

Q.—What year was that ?

A.—I do not know the exact year. As far as I know it has never been published. Perhaps the Commission will be able to get information in regard to it which is not at present before the public. I presume the Calcutta Government will have some record of the proceedings.

Q.—*Mr. Pease.*—Is there any evidence that he was authorised by the Chinese Government?

A.—I understood he came with the approval of the Chinese Government.

Q.—*Chairman.*—Was he a properly accredited representative of the Chinese Government ?

A.—I am not sure how far he was officially accredited. He must have received some introduction.

Q.—You have no direct knowledge ?

A.—No, it has simply reached me unofficially. The Marquis Tseng in 1886 in a letter addressed to our Secretary said:—This treaty I admit does not accomplish the desired result, but it would prove nevertheless the first important step towards checking the use and abuse of opium. The British Government as well as my own will enjoy greater facilities in future for re-opening negotiation on the opium question with a view of agreeing to measures that would reduce each year the quantity of importation and consumption. "The British Government may in the meantime see its way clear to place restrictions upon the present cultivation, in which case my Government would surely lose no time in following the example and put an effectual check upon the growth of opium in China." Since then the only evidence that I think I can bring before the Commission as to the willingness of the Chinese Government still, and its desire, to concur in such an arrangement, is that derived from the interviews which His Excellency Li Hung Chung, the Great Chinese Viceroy, has accorded to some of our friends: to Mr. Dyer of Bombay in 1890, and more recently to the Revd. Dr. Glover and Mr. Morris a deputation from the Baptist Missionary Society, who were visiting China. In those interviews Li Hung Chang expresses the great desire of the Chinese Government to put down the trade. I do not remember that in either of these interviews this special proposal was again put forward. Li Hung Chang at all events recognised that this is a great evil, and expressed himself in the strongest terms as to the impossibility of the Chinese Government taking any practical

step to deal with that evil, except by some agreement with the British Government which would aim at the suppression of the import from India.

Q.—Was Li Hung Chang on the occasions to which you are referring expressing his own individual views, or was he putting forward the opinion of his Government?

A.—I think he was speaking his own individual views, but the Commision has already had some evidence on that question. The Revd. J. S. Adams put before the Commission his very strong view that that opinion is almost universally held amongst the higher statesmen of China. I have had similar very strong opinions from Dr. Dudgeon of Pekin, who was Private Secretary to the Marquis Tseng, and who knows a great deal of many of the higher officials in Pekin. I may remind the Commission, too, that Sir Thomas Wade in his evidence said he would not undertake to say whether the majority of Chinese statesmen are or are not strongly opposed to the opium traffic. In particular Tso Tsung Tang, whose position and influence, as I understand, are only second to those of Li Hung Chang himself, is known as a strong and determined opponent of the opium traffic.

Q.—Sir Thomas Wade placed before us in London, a report entitled Conferences on the Opium Question, which had taken place between himself and the Ministers of the Tsung-Li-Yamen in 1881-82. To the best of my recollection he called our attention to a declaration made by the Yamen to this effect that, while desiring to see the abuse of opium repressed in China, the Yamen held the view that the habit was now so widely spread in China that any reform must be the result of a general moral improvement among the people; that they recognise that the growth of opium in China had become so extensive that it would be impossible by merely putting an end to the trade in India to put an end to the supply of opium; and that for the moment they held the view that there were many questions of greater urgency than the decisive step of absolutely prohibiting the importation of opium. I believe that was the effect of the conversations to which Sir Thomas Wade called our attention in London.

A.—I should say with regard to that conversation referred to by Sir Thomas Wade that we only have his account of it, which of course rests chiefly on his own private memoranda. We know how, when a man has strong views, he is apt to take others as agreeing with them perhaps more than they really do; and no official or public statement of that kind has ever been made by Chinese statesmen.

Q.—In the concluding part of the third paragraph of your memorial you refer to the abolition of what are described as licensed smoking dens throughout India. Have you anything more to say upon that subject ?

A.—On that point we rejoice in the action of the Government of India as a very decided step in the right direction, but it seems to us to require supplementing by further measures in the same direction. That has been suggested in a correspondence presented to Parliament this year at the instance of Mr. Caine—a correspondence arising out of a confidential circular issued by the Board of Revenue of the North-West Provinces and Oudh. In his despatch closing that correspondence, Lord Kimberley says, under date 16th of March 1893.—"The question arises whether the law ought not to be strengthened, so as to enable your officers to take legal steps for suppressing private opium saloons ; otherwise, if unlicensed saloons for opium-smoking can be established without hindrance, the object which was thought to be attained by prohibiting opium-smoking on the premises of licensed opium vendors may be practically defeated. I shall be glad to learn the views of your Government on this point." I am not aware whether the Indian Government has replied to that enquiry of Lord Kimberley. We strongly hold the view expressed by Lord Kimberley that it is desirable to prevent private and unlicensed opium dens or opium clubs being established so as to provide facilities within the law for this practice of opium-smoking which the Indian Government has by its action and its minute recognized as being undoubtedly a very great evil.

Q.—You refer to the removal of the Minimum Guarantee Clause from the agreement made with those who hold opium licenses in Bombay. Have you anything to say on that ?

A.—I can only say that we also rejoice in that as a step in the right direction. I may be allowed to add one point. In going through India with Mr. Wilson, I have had my attention called to the fact that this measure of the suppression of opium dens has not been fully carried out. We visited a town, which I think it better not to name because I do not want to bring special officials before the Commisson. In that town we were taken to three opium dens on the premises of licensed opium vendors, where we saw in three of them chandu smoking and in one muddak smoking going on just as if no order had been issued by the Government of India. I think it desirable to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that, although those orders have been put into the licenses in every province prohibiting the sale of opium for smoking on the premises,

those orders have not been fully carried out, as I have seen with my own eyes.

Q.—*Mr. Fanshawe*.—Were those public shops ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Licensed public shops ?

A.—We were told that they were licensed. Our gharry driver was a Mahommedan, and we were told that he would be able to take us to the places. He took us, and we found them open, with no attempt at concealment.

Q.—Where were they ?

A.—I would rather not mention the town ; but I will send the name up to the Chairman.

Q.—*Chairman*—You had better mention it.

A.—It was in the town of Gya. We were told that there were some others also in the same town.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall.*—In the third paragraph of your memorial you speak of "the extremely objectionable 'minimum guarantee' clause contained in the opium licenses used in the Presidency of Bombay." Do you not think that that is a very strong term to use ?

A.—It seemed to me that it was extremely objectionable in the natural operation. I am aware of the object which was intended in the insertion of that clause, that is, to prevent smuggling ; but it seems to me that the necessary operation of such a clause would be that there would be great pressure put upon the licensee to extend his sales so as not to incur the risk of a fine.

Q.—I think you are aware that before that system was invented there was most extensive smuggling. The licensed vendors in Bombay, though they paid heavily for their licenses and sold a good deal of opium, yet took hardly any of the high-priced Government opium for their shop and relied entirely upon the smuggling trade ?

A.—I have been so informed.

Q.—So that there were strong reasons for it ?

A.—I do not impute bad motives to the Government in adopting that clause, nevertheless I think that the clause as adopted was "extremely objectionable," as the memorial says, and I am glad that it has been done away with.

Q.—A man could only have one shop, he could not establish branch shops ; the license only allowed him to establish a certain shop and sell to anybody who came ?

A.—Except with permission of the Government official.

Q.—If that permission was not given as a rule, he had only one shop ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It would make a great difference to him in the amount he sold whether he had to pay the maximum amount or not ?

A.—The ordinary motives of self-interest would make a man sell as much as he could. You may strengthen those motives by telling him that he is under a fine if he does not sell a certain quantity.

Q.—Under that strong motive how would he increase the sale ?

A.—I have heard since I have been in India of a licensee sending round to his customers, if they did not turn up at the accustomed period in the evening, to ask them why they did not come, in that way trying to induce a man who was perhaps making some struggle to free himself.

Q.—*Mr. Fanshawe.*—With regard to Gya, I understand that your statement depends on information given you by a gharry driver. Did you notice if there was a licensed board up at the shop.

A.—The information was not given by the driver, but it was given me by the Baptist Pastor of the place. He referred to our driver as being a man who would know where the shops were. It was he who made the statement to us that the shops were Government licensed shops.

Q.—Was any licensed board up in front of the shops ?

A.—I did not observe any board.

Q.—*Mr. Mowbray.*—You are quite aware that similar difficulties have arisen in England with regard to clubs and public houses ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You are aware that there was a Committee of the House of Commons sitting on that subject last year ?

A.—I did not remember that; I take it from you, and I have no doubt it is so.

Q.—And so far as I know, Government have not taken any steps to put down these clubs in England ?

A.—I do not think they have, but I think the Temperance party, f I may speak as a humble member of that party, is very desirous indeed

and is endeavouring to put pressure upon the Government, to introduce a measure dealing with clubs.

Q.—*Mr. Wilson.*—Upon that point about the bogus clubs in England, I suppose you are also aware that the members of the licensed trade are equally anxious to get them put down?

A.—I believe it is so.

Q.—*Chairman* :—Returning to your General Memorial, in the fourth paragraph you say that you accept those measures of reform which have already been adopted as steps in the right direction, but in your view those measures fall short of carrying out the resolution which the House of Commons had approved. You then proceed to make a reference to the observations of Mr. Gladstone to the Electors of Midlothian, and you hold that those observations imply a sympathy with the cause which you have taken up. You then refer to the specific measures which you would recommend for adoption with a view to the repression of the opium trade. You also refer to the Bengal opium monopoly, to the Malwa transit duty system, and to the excise system. Then in your seventh paragraph you proceed to deal somewhat more in detail with Bengal opium monopoly. You recommend that there should be an immediate reduction in the area of poppy cultivation with a view to limiting the production of opium to that which medical use requires; and you complain that opium is not prepared in India for medical use, but solely for sensual indulgence. Have you anything further to say upon that subject?

A.—I should like to point out under this paragraph the great distinction between opium prepared for medical use and opium prepared for smoking or opium-eating, which is what we mean by sensual indulgence. The British Pharmacopeia does not admit of the use of Indian opium in the preparation of medicines in England. In Fluckiger and Hanbury's Pharmacographia it is shown that Indian opium, though very potent for intoxicating purposes, does not contain a sufficient proportion of those ingredients which are specially useful for medical purposes. In this paragraph we point out that a specially prepared article is issued from the Government Agencies to the Medical Department in India. No doubt a good deal of opium prepared, for the Excise Department, and prepared, as I should say, for intoxicating use, is in fact used by doctors in India for medical purposes. And Dr. Maxwell, who gave evidence with regard to China, told me that when he was practising in Formosa, having run out of medical opium, he had used the Indian smoking opium.

Q.—*Sir William Roberts*:—I think he said Indian crude opium?

A.—That is what I mean, crude opium intended to be prepared for smoking purposes.

Q.—He added that it answered just as well?

A.—I did not remember that. I suppose he must have nsed it in some different proportions.

Q.—The differences are really very slight.

A.—Fluckiger and Hanbnry, I think, speak of the difference as being considerable.

Q.—The analysis can be had; the differences are very slight.

A.—Dr. Fluckiger has snggested that the Indian Government would do well to pay attention to the demand for good opium for medical use, and prepare opium with a view of competing with the Turkey drug which at present has a monopoly for medical use in Great Britain and Europe generally. I have varions anthorities that I can refer to on the question of its being prepared for sensual indulgence. That largely rests upon a statement made by Julius Jeffreys, F. R. S., formerly Staff Surgeon of Cawnpore, and Civil Surgeon at Fategarh, published in 1858 in an appendix to a book on the British Army in India:—"My own acquaintance with the subject dates from the year 1831, when, in passing by water the chief opinm magazine of the East India Company at Patna, I paid a visit to a friend who had charge of the scientific department of it. After he had led me through story after story and gallery after gallery of the factory, with opinm balls right and left tiered in shelves to the ceiling, upon my expressing amazement at an exhibition of opium enough to supply the medical wants of the world for years, he replied, nearly in these words: 'I see yon are very innocent; these stores of opium have no such beneficent destination. It is all going to debauch the Chinese, and my duty is to maintain its smack as attractive to them as possible. Come to my laboratory.' There I saw broken balls of opium procured, I understood, from China, by the Bengal Government, as approved musters (samples) for imitation by the cultivators." Mr. Jeffreys adds: "Upon looking around for information, I heard that the natives, where they ventured an opinion, the Mahommedans especially, were equally scandalized at the engagement of the Company in such a traffic."

Q.—What year was that?

A.—The visit was in 1831.

Q.—I presume you are aware that very little was then known about opinm smoking?

A.—Not very much in 1831. It was about 1840 that the first pamphlets came out attacking the opium trade. Bishop Thoburn referred to the fact that it was condemned in very strong terms in the Impeachment of Warren Hastings more than 100 years ago. And the East Indian Company's despatch of 1817, sanctioning the establishment of the excise system of selling opium in India, spoke in the strongest terms of condemnation of the habit. The Directors said that in compassion to mankind they would gladly stop the traffic altogether were it possible.

Q.—Do you draw any distinction in point of moral responsibility between the working of a system such as the Bengal opium monopoly and the position taken by the Government in other parts of India where it is not a manufacturer or producer, and interposes only to levy export duties and to enforce the payment of licenses. I believe that has been done in some pamphlets issued by your Association ?

A.—Yes, I was intending to deal with that under paragraph thirteen, but I may as well take it here. I may say that the opinions expressed in that pamphlet dealing with Sir William Muir's minute are not the opinions held by our Society now.

Q.—When was that pamphlet published ?

A.—Very early in the history of the Society—in 1875.

Q.—You were not connected with the society at that time ?

A.—I was not.

Q.—Was Sir Joseph Pease connected with it ?

A.—Yes ; he was not President then. Lord Shaftesbury was President until his death. There was some difference of view, as I explained in London. In starting the Society it was not committed to any very definite policy. That came out in a meeting at the Mansion House held in 1883, when three different speakers suggested three different lines. One speaker advocated a policy of gradual suppression. I think it was Lord Shaftesbury himself. Another speaker, who I think was Sir Robert Fowler, our late Treasurer, advocated that the change of policy should be on the line of Sir William Muir's minute. Cardinal Manning who was a subsequent speaker, quoted the old story about the king who wished that all his nobles had but one neck so that he might strike them all off at a blow, and he applied that to the opium traffic. He very strongly objected to the suggestion that the opium traffic should be handed over to private capitalists, because he pointed out that if that were the case, you would at once have a number

of vested interests like those that we have in England in connection with the liquor traffic. He would rather have the one neck of the Government of India to deal with than have the vested rights of a number of private capitalists. Since that time that view has been completely accepted by our Society, and in the Statement of Facts and Principles which I put in, and which was adopted by us at the beginning of 1886, the suppression of the cultivation of the poppy in Bengal was for the first time I think distinctly laid down as the programme of the Society, and it is embodied in paragraph 13 of the memorial to Lord Kimberley.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall :*—Suppression not merely of the monopoly but of the cultivation ?

A.—Not merely of the monopoly, but of the cultivation.

Q.—*Chairman :*—You put that forward now as the view held unanimously by the members of your Society ?

A.—Unanimously by the active members of our Society.

Q.—What interpretion do you put upon the passage in Sir Joseph Pease's speech last session which I quoted in my question to Sir David Barbour ?

A.—I think Sir Joseph Pease only meant to say what we have said in paragraph thirteen, that is, that the Calcutta sales are the most prominent and the most obviously indefensible part of the system from our point of view ; that the Malwa system has more analogy to the drink traffic repressed by taxation with which we are familiar in our own country ; and that the fact that the Government holds this position under the monopoly brings out in a more glaring light the evils of the system.

Q.—You have nothing further to say on the Bengal monopoly ?

A.—It is sometimes said that there are no precedents for the prohibition of a trade in this way by a Government. I venture to put before the Commission two precedents both relating to the liquor traffic. One is under the North Sea Convention for the protection of sailors in the North Sea against the liquor traffic that used to be carried on by what were called coopers.

Q.—You would not draw any parallel between the North Sea liquor traffic and the opium traffic of India in point of magnitude ?

A.—No, not in point of magnitude certainly. I refer to it simply as answering the objection that has been raised against our proposal that it is altogether unprecedented. That is a precedent, I think, for the absolute prohibition of traffic of a similar character. The second

is that of the Brussels Anti-Slavery Convention, under which a large zone of Central Africa is absolutely protected from the liquor traffic. The provision is that where the liquor traffic has not yet been carried on in Africa, it is totally prohibited. This Convention also porvides, by taxation for the limitation of the local traffic in those districts where it already exists.

Q.—In the case of Africa, I apprehend there is no difference of opinion among professional experts as to the effect of indulgence in liquor by the African tribes ;—they are unanimous that it is a bad thing ?

A.—That is so, and I think there is practical unanimity in regard to the effects of opium in China.

Q.—With regard to the Malwa system, you deal with that in the eighth paragraph, and you say that, with a view to preventing the cultivation of opium beyond what is required for medical use, it is desirable that there should be a mutual prohibition enforced alike in British India and in the Malwa States, and you say that if such an arrangement were made, the objection which has been urged on the part of the Government of India to the proposals on the ground of smuggling would be to a large extent removed. Have yon anything to say in development of these views ?

A.—I would simply more clearly bring out our view that the Bengal trade ought first to be stopped. The Government of India ought first to cease itself from deriving on revenue from carrying on this trade. Having stopped the Bengal system and having given up its own revenue, it would then be in a position to go to the Chiefs of the Native States and say: "We on moral grounds have abandoned this trade, feeling that it is indefensible and ask you to follow our example."

Q.—How long would you coneede to the Government of India for the purpose of dealing with the case in Bengal?

A.—I would say that it should be done as quickly as possible, and would say, Stop the trade immediately and convert the stocks you have in hand to medical use at once.

Q.—You recognise the financial difficulty ?

A.—Yes I do, but I am unable to put a financial difficulty on the same line with a moral objection. I think England should help in regard to the financial difficulty. I should like to add another point on the eighth paragraph. I think that pressure upon the Native States would be justifiable, should it become necessary, on the ground that in the past we have forced the trade upon the Chinese ; that if the Chinese Gov-

ernment had succeeded in its effort in 1840 to put down the trade, the Native States would have lost the whole of their trade. It is the force of the British arms that established the trade and has kept it open ever since, and on that ground we should be entitled to exercise pressure upon the Native States if necessary; though I would only advocate that in the last resort.

The difficulty as to the smuggling of opium would be met, as far as regards the States of Central India, which produce opium by an arrangement of that kind with the Native States. That is my answer to those who say that smuggling would be an insuperable difficulty. Some little difficulty might no doubt arise as regards smuggling over the North West Frontier and perhaps Bhopal, but I do not think that it is so formidable as is often stated. Sir Charles Aitchison, in a memorandum in 1880 with regard to opium in Burma, says—"As regards smuggling, I do not believe that, even with our open seaboard of 1,000 miles and our long and unguarded frontier with Upper Burma, the Shan States and Siam, there would be a very great increase in illicit traffic, either from Bengal or from China, if the importation of opium were altogether forbidden and the possession of opium were made illegal. Already the price of opium is artificially forced up to a maximum, presenting the very strongest temptation to the smuggler, while the fact that possession of the drug is not unlawful increases the difficulty of detection. The pecuniary temptation cannot become very much greater than it is if opium were altogether forbidden; the drug wherever found would be contraband without question, and we should have the sympathies of the people with us in the suppression of smuggling. One fact is worth a bushel of argument; we have succeeded in almost stamping out ganja, although the plant from which it is made grows wild in Burma. The difficulties we have in any case to contend with, in preventing smuggling are so great that an addition to them would not be a very appreciable burden. Anyhow, smuggling, even on a considerable scale, would never lead to the universal consumption of the drug; and the extension of the revenue is not to be compared to the gradual demoralization of the people."

Q.—*Sir James Lyall*:—With reference to the Bengal opium monopoly I understand that your Society admits that the Bengal monopoly system is preferable to the Malwa or export duty system as the most powerful engine for restricting and regulating internal consumption; and the preference is not based simply upon the fact that it is easier to attack, but it is also admitted that, if the prohibition of cultivation is not to be enforced, the Bengal monopoly system is the most powerful engine possible for restricting and regulating the internal consumption?

A.—I do not think we have ever admitted that. We recognise that there will be a risk in changing the system—that if we really changed the system, we might find ourselves worse off. My own private opinion is that we in all probability should not find ourselves worse off.

Q.—Not worse off in what way ?

A.—I mean there might be a greater consumption—it might possibly lead to a greater trade.

Q.—If you free the trade ?

A.—And simply placed it under a system of excise similar to that which we have at home in regard to the manufacture of beer.

Q.—You do not think that your Society admitted that, but you yourself are inclined to think so?

A.—I beg your pardon, I am inclined to think otherwise.

Q.—What, that the free trade system is better for internal consumption than the Bengal system?

A.—I do not suppose that anybody contemplated free trade.

Q.—Free growth and an excise and export duty ?

A.—Excise and export duty, a system such as that sketched out by Sir William Muir, which is one of licensing the growth.

Q.—Do you think that would be better for regulating and restricting internal consumption than the Bengal monopoly system?

A.—Yes. My personal opinion is that probably there would be less grown and less trade altogether under such a system than under the present system.

Q.—I am speaking of internal consumption ?

A.—I have not formed an opinion about that. I recognise that there are risks, and that we might possibly find ourselves worse off. The Society has recognized those risks, and does not wish to make the experiment.

Q.—Are you aware that poppy cultivation once extended throughout India in all parts where the soil and the climate were suitable, and, except in certain favorable tracts, it was mainly or entirely for consumption, not an export trade; and are you aware that the operation of the Bengal opium monopoly and the policy of the Government of India in connection with it since its first establishment, more than a hundred years ago, have had the effect of putting an end to poppy cultivation in much the greater part of British India and in the greater part of the territory held by the Native States—are you aware of that?

A.—I could not say that I was aware of it as regards the Native States. As regards British India, I am aware that poppy cultivation existed here and there over a large part of it until the measures were taken at the end of the last century to which we have referred to in paragraph eleven.

Q.—In Mysore and Hyderabad by agreement with the Government, poppy cultivation was prohibited. There are two instances; and all the Native States under the control of Bombay are also other instances?

A.—I cannot say I was aware of it. I have no doubt you are correct.

Q.—Then but for the monopoly and the policy in connection with it would not the cultivation of the poppy and the consumption and export of opium have been in all probability much greater than they are under the present system?

A.—It is quite possible. I cannot form a definite opinion as to what would have been.

Q.—I ask the question because in the anti-opium literature these facts are altogether ignored and it might be thought that we had introduced the cultivation of the poppy and entirely created the export trade?

A.—I think we have frequently used the fact that the Government of India prohibit and put down the opium growth in many parts of India as an argument why it should and could do the same in the remainder of India. We have used that as an argument in paragraph eleven and often refer to it in our publications.

Q.—In paragraph seven you speak of limiting the production of opium to that which medical use requires. That means, does it not, that it must only be supplied on medical advice?

A.—That is our view.

Q.—But the mass of natives of India prefer their own system of medicine to ours; they may admit the superiority of our surgery, but they prefer their own system of medicine. Our doctors on the contrary say that their ideas of medicine are all wrong. Is not that a difficulty in laying down a rule that opium should only be supplied on medical advice of some kind?

A.—I should not have thought so. I include in medical advice Native as well as European doctors, advice according to the native system as well as according to the European.

Q.—You are aware that the medical system of the village doctors is of a most primitive kind possible?

A.—I was not aware of that.

Q.—That people administer medicine for themselves, a man advising for his own family or for his neighbour?

A.—We attempt to deal with that in England, where people also medicate themselves to a great extent, by directing that no medicine of a poisonous character shall be sold except by druggists.

Q.—Do you think from what you know or of what you have heard of India that the native practitioners, the hakims and vaidas, can be trusted with the power of prescribing opium and saying whether it shall be used for medical purposes or not, there being great inducements for them to misuse their power owing to the large demand for opium as a stimulant?

A.—My answer is that you must work with such tools as you have. Although it may be true that the medical profession in India (using the word in the large sense of all who practise medicine) is not in a very satisfactory state, and that there would be some temptations of the kind you have suggested, yet it is far better that a general restriction should be applied than that the sale should be perfectly public and open, and every man allowed to get poisonous drugs exactly as he pleased.

Q.—You know that opium is a stimulant, as alcohol is; would it not be very difficult to draw a line between the use of such a thing for medical requirements and its use for other purposes? If you asked most people who took opium moderately why they took it at all, they would nearly all answer that they took it because they thought it did them good; how can you possibly draw a line and say that in this case it is for medical use and in that case it is not?

A.—I cannot admit the suggestion that most people in India who use opium even, as you say, moderately would say that it was doing them good. It may be so, and my limited knowledge of India does not entitle me to say that it is not, but I cannot be taken to admit that it is. I have heard a good deal in India to the contrary,—that those who take opium even in comparatively small doses admit that it does not do them good.

Q.—*Sir William Roberts*:—Do you not recognize the analogy between the use of brandy in our country, partly as an intoxicant and largely as a domestic remedy, and the use of opium? Is not the parallel pretty even?

A.—No, I should have thought not.

Q.—Why not?

A.—There is this broad distiniction, at all events, that opium has been recognized by medical science as a poison and that at home we do attempt to protect our people from its indiscriminate use in that way. We have not yet given that protection at home against alcohol, and if it were to be extended to India it would be something beyond what we have at home.

Q.—Is not that begging the question that India and home are identical in regard to opium ?

A.—It is assuming that opium being a poison in England is also a poison in India. We certainly do assume that.

Q.—Sir James Lyall.—Are you aware that the English system which you recommend to be introduced is not sufficient for preventing any person who wants to get opium for excessive indulgence ?

A.—We have admitted in our ninth paragraph that the provisions of the present law as regards opium are too lax. I may explain briefly what the provisions are in the Pharmacy Act. The Act divides poisons into two categories—violent poisons, amongst which strychnine and arsenic are included, and milder poisons, amongst which opium and all the preparations of opium are included. With regard to the more violent poisons, the provisions are exceedingly strict ; they can only be sold by certified druggists, who must make entries and have a knowledge of the person, to whom they are selling. With regard to opium, as one of the milder drugs, the provisions are only that it must be sold by a registered druggist and that it must be labelled " poison." There is a considerable amount of medical opinion at home in favour of taking opium out of the milder category and putting it in the stricter.

Q.—You are aware that under the present system in the Fens and other parts of England where opium is freely taken as it is in India the druggists have it prepared on market days on their counters ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—People come in and take the opium without question ?

A.—I am aware that that is so, and that medical men and other observers in those districts speak of it as a very great evil, and greatly deplore that such a state of things exists.

Q.—Some do and some do not ; some medical men justify the system ?

A.—I think I have seen one opinion of that kind, but I have heard a good many to the contrary.

Q.—Has your society ever thought out any system for India by which opium would be available for medical use and yet not available as a stimulant ?

A.—We have taken the view that that was a question upon which we at home could not work out the details, that we could only lay down principles and leave the Indian Government, which knows India and has its officials to consult, to ascertain the best way of applying those principles.

Q.—In paragraph eight you say :—"As regards Malwa opium we would point out that the present wide extension of poppy cultivation in the Native States is due to the policy of the British Government itself." Then you go on to quote as an authority the statement made by Mr. St. George Tucker. Has your society made any further enquiry to test the correctness of Mr. Tucker's statement ? Does it still adhere to the statement as true in fact that the present wide extension of poppy cultivation is due to the policy of the British Government itself ?

A.—I do not think the society can be said to have made any further enquiry. I have received from yourself information, which you were good enough to furnish me with on the voyage out, which I admit tends to show that Mr. Tucker probably somewhat inaccurately represented the state of the case. We naturally took his statement as being that of a very great authority, and we were not aware of any facts which would displace the statement.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall:*—You have not seen the memorandum as to the arrangement with the Native States which the Government of India prepared ?

A.—No I only received it yesterday and I have not been able to look through it.

Q.—Have you looked at the subject in Sir Charles Aitchison's work ?

A.—I looked up the book and I was unsuccessful, I may almost say, in finding any trace of the opium question. Perhaps there was a foot-note somewhere.

Q.—There is a copy of the Treaty made in 1820 with Holkar and a similar treaty with nine other States. In his philanthropic zeal Mr. Tucker mistook the facts and misrepresented them. You will find the treaty given there ?

A.—I did so, but I did not read it in such a way as to contradict Mr. Tucker's statement. I think Sir Charles Aitchison's object was to

show that the new arran gement was better than the old, and that it seems to me from every point of view it undoubtedly is.

Q.—You mean better than that made by treaty ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Better for the Native States. They objected strongly to the old arrangement and so did the natives. The object of the treaties was to bring poppy cultivation into control and reduce it for the benefit of the Bengal opium ?

A.—It led to a system of espionage which was unendurable. We mention that the treaties were repealed in paragraph eight.

Q.—Mr. Tucker stated that we contracted burdensome treaties with the Rajput States to introduce and to extend the cultivation of the poppy. There he was entirely wrong, as any reference to the authorities will show?

A.—I am glad to know that it is so. I take it from you.

Q.—When you say: "at the present time the Native States engage so to manage their opium cultivation and production as to safeguard the British revenue; and in exchange for this service they receive either money compensation or other concessions,—" did you imagine that the Native States there referred to were the same Native States—the Rajput Native States or Rajputana or Central India ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—As a matter of fact they are not the same Native States ?

A.—We have given a reference to the passage. It is not our statement, but the statement of the Government of India in the Report on the Moral and Material Progress of India, 1887-88.

Q.—Those States are Bombay Native States ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The Native States under the Bombay Government ; it may be that other Native States are included like Hyderabad and Mysore; but in all cases when money compensation or other concessions are given they are given with a restrictive object ?

A.—All I can say is that that did not appear to us to be the meaning of the paragraph. If you tell me it is so, I will accept it on your statement. In my examination-in-chief, I have endeavoured to put our case as regards the Malwa opium on quite different and broader grounds.

Q.—Would it not have been better to enquire of some person in authority before making a statement of that sort in a letter like this ?

A.—I think we were surely justified in taking these statements from two such high authorities and putting them down in their plain and obvious meaning. Of course we labour under great difficulties in England. Not nearly all the papers of the Government of India are published in England.

Q.—You piece the two things together—Mr. Tucker's statement of 1881 and something that is said in the Moral and Material Progress in 1887—six years after. Surely you might have enquired of some person in authority?

A.—Those two statements seemed to justify the statement we made.

Q.—*Mr. Fanshawe.*—Your Society has recommended that opium should only be purchasable in Chemists shops?

A.—It has never made that recommendation, so far as I know.

Q.—It is in a pamphlet addressed by the President of your Society to Lord Cross, and it is also made by some medical men at home, and quoted with approval. I think it is distinctly stated by your Society?

A.—It has not been made by the Society; it certainly has not come before me as an official publication.

Q.—Does not this letter from the President represent the Soeiety?

A.—The Society is not committed to every statement in that letter.

Q.—Does it not represent the views of the Society?

A.—Will you read the words?

Q.—At page twenty-three he says: "With regard to No. 2, dealing with old established habits I would submit for Your Lordship's consideration that in substituting the Chemist's shop for the opium market, etc.,"—putting that forward as a recommendation of the Society. Then he says:—"I believe Your Lordship is already aware that upwards of 5,000 medical men, some of them knowing India thoroughly, have signed the following declaration:" one of the paragraphs being, "That the drug opium ought in India as in England to be classed and sold as a poison and be purchasable from Chemists only." I should like to know what your Society contemplates in speaking of the Chemists' shops as applied to a large part of India?

A.—Our Society has not made that proposal. Our proposals will be found in paragraph nine.

Q.—What proposals?

A.—"We would urge upon Your Lordship to request the Indian Government without delay to prepare and adopt such regulations under the Indian Opium and Excise Acts as may be found best suited to adapt to the

requirements of British India the fundamental principles that the sale of poisonous drugs is to be restricted to medical and scientific use, and that discretionary powers for such sale should be entrusted only to responsible and carefully selected persons, who possess adequate knowledge of the deleterious properties of these drugs, who can readily be called to account for any improper use of the discretion conferred upon them, and whose remuneration in no degree depends on the amount of their sales.".

Q.—Then I may take it that your answer is that you have not thought out for yourselves the means by which the opium could be supplied even for medical purposes throughout the country?

A.—I did not say we had not thought it out, but that we had left it to the Indian Government to apply the principles laid down in the way that the circumstances of India might require—the principles which underlie our home legislation.

Q.—You do not see the difficulty?

A.—No doubt there are difficulties, but I do not know what Governments and Statesmen are for, if it is not to deal with difficulties and overcome them.

Q.—With regard to the limitation to medical use only, I will ask you to take the case of the Central Provinces, where Dr. Rice told us that many persons living in malarial conditions, the causes being constant and the effects constant, take opium in very moderate doses. Would you cut off that whole class of Indian society from the possibility of obtaining opium?

A.—I spent some days in the Central Provinces, and I was informed that a measure of this kind would be generally welcomed.

Q.—How would you arrange to provide those men with that kind of dose, so small that it was described as almost a medical use, or do you intend that they should be cut off from the possibility of obtaining it?

A.—I think it is quite necessary, as part of the policy of prohibition. I have been everywhere told in India that those moderate doses almost invariably lead to greater doses—that those who begin go on.

Q.—Are you aware that in many parts of India very great changes in temperature, especially during the cold seasons, take place, and that generally malarial conditions prevail?

A.—Yes.

Q.—If it was shown that the use of opium is a comfort in the way of enabling men to withstand that cold—ill-clad men as most of them are—would you still propose that they should be entirely deprived?

A.—I apprehend that if the Commission is satisfied on that point, it will not report in favour of prohibition.

Q.—You wish to confine it to medical purposes?

A.—Of course, to begin with, our Society has a conviction that it is not necessary. But even if it were established that there are some districts in India where there is a moderate use which is perhaps not injurious but even slightly beneficial, we might still think that the evils produced by opium are so great that any deprivation to small classes of that kind would be greatly overbalanced by the benefit to the people of India as a whole from the prohibitive policy.

Q.—But if it could be shown that they are not small classes, but to some extent large classes?

A.—It must be simply a question of a balance of considerations.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall.*—You said you would be prepared to cut off those classes of moderate consumers from the use of opium, but in answer to my question you said you would entrust the discretion of prescribing opium for medical use to all the vaidas and hakims, Native medical practitioners in India. Would not these medical practitioners prescribe opium in those cases?

A.—That seems to me a very hypothetical question. Perhaps I made rather too large an admission when I assumed that medical advice would include such practitioners as you have spoken of. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the classes of which you speak. It may be that some of them are what in England we should call quacks, whom the law does not recognize as entitled to give medical advice.

Q.—*Mr. Mowbray.*—Did I understand you to say that your society contemplated in the last resort, compulsion in the case of these Native States if the cultivation of the poppy in British India were abandoned?

A.—Yes, I think so. These Native States are entirely dependent for their export trade upon the permission of the British Government that the drug should pass through its States, and if the Government has stopped its own trade purely on moral grounds, I think it would in the last resort be justified in refusing that permission to the Native States.

Q.—I suppose your society contemplated the alternative method of compensation?

A.—I do not think I can say officially that the Society has done so. No doubt that might come into operation. I do not think the Society would have any objection of principle, if it can be shown that

there is a real hardship in cutting off some of the revenue from the Native States, to their receiving compensation.

Q.—I should have thought that before contemplating compulsion you would have contemplated the necessity of compensation?

A.—We have been unable to ascertain exactly how far the Native States derive any substantial revenue from this system, and until one has the facts as to the profits derived from the Native States it seems premature to go into the question of compensation. I hope the Commission will obtain full evidence on that point.

Q.—With regard to the statement put forward by your Society with regard to the Indian Government as to the readiness of the English people to provide money in substitution of the opium revenue, that item has not been taken into consideration?

A.—It has not.

Q.—*Mr. Wilson.*—You have referred to the Bombay system. I think it is unfortunate that the Commission has not had some official witnesses to describe to us exactly what the existing system is in different parts of India?

Chairman.—You will have them.

Q.—*Mr. Wilson.*—It is like putting the cart before the horse. I am therefore obliged to ask you to tell the Commission what you understand to be the Bombay system?

A.—I cannot do so better than by reading paragraph 6, sub-section 2 of the memorial; "The Malwa transit duty system, under which by arrangement of the Indian Government, opium grown and prepared in some of the Native States of Central India pays to the Government of India, on its passage to Bombay for export, a heavy transit duty, equal to nearly two-thirds of the present wholesale price at Bombay; the revenue obtained from it by the Native Princes being only a small percentage of that received by the Government of India."

Q.—With reference to the use of opium by certain persons or classes, have you ever contemplated the possibility of a system of registration such as already prevails in part of Burma?

A.—It has recently been introduced in Lower Burma, and it is a suggestion that we have considered, but on which we have not finally pronounced an opinion, that possibly some system of that kind might be devised to meet the case of habitual consumers, so that you might allow them to continue to obtain the drug in doses to which they are accus-

tomed, whilst stopping the spread of the habit by making it impossible for fresh individuals to obtain the drug in the same way.

Q.—Has the possibility of any system of local option been at all considered?

A.—I do not think I can say that our Society has considered that. The Anglo-Indian Temperance Society, of which Mr. Caine is Honorary Secretary, and which on this opium question in India works concurrently with our own, has considered it, and I believe it has pronounced in favour of local option as applied to opium as well as ~~hemp drugs.~~ alcohol But our Society has never officially pronounced an opinion on the question of local option.

Q.—May we take it that the Society has never considered it a part of its duty to work out an elaborate system adapted to every part of India and to the varying circumstances, but that you would be quite prepared dispassionately to consider any proposals that might be made for meeting the various difficulties?

A.—I am sure the Society would gladly consider any proposal of that kind which might be made by the Commission, after obtaining fuller evidence than it has been possible for us to obtain in England.

Q.—You consider that the elaborate details of any system ought to be worked out by the responsible Government and not by a voluntary Society?

A.—That is my view.

Q.—*Mr. Pease.*—Is it not a fact that at one time the duty from Native States was Rs. 700 per chest?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And that duty was reduced to encourage the Native States to increase the quantity of opium produced?

A.—I think that would be overstating the case. It was reduced, because, as I understand, it was found that the duty of Rs. 700 was likely to kill out the trade. It was only at Rs. 700 for a short time; it was then reduced to Rs. 650, because Government found that Rs. 700 was more than the trade would bear. Two or three years ago on the petition of the Bombay merchants it was reduced it to Rs. 600, because the merchants stated that it was no longer a remunerative trade.

Q.—*Chairman.*—With reference to the ninth paragraph, in which you deal with the excise system, you express a belief that "there is evidence that grave dissatisfaction is felt in India at the facilities offered

by the existing system for the sale of these drugs." You cite the practice at home under our latest legislation, and you propose that the fundamental and underlying principles which have been accepted in England should be extended to British India. I think in cross-examination you have already made a very full statement upon that subject, and perhaps you have nothing more to say with reference to the excise system in India?

A.—As regards other narcotic drugs, I should like to explain how we were led to take up this question in India. Our Society was formed for the purpose of putting a stop to the opium trade between India and China, and if you refer to Mr. Storrs Turner's Prize Essay, you will see that he speaks with satisfaction with regard to the measures adopted by the Indian Government to protect its own subjects against the evils of opium. In a note subsequently written he refers to facts which had just come under his observation with regard to Burma, as showing that that satisfaction could not be extended to Burma, though he thought it applied to India generally. It is only within the last four or five years that our attention has been called to a number of statements which seemed to us to deserve consideration and enquiry, to the effect that in several parts of India the use of opium was greatly extending, and that serious evils were arising from it. It was on that ground that we for the first time took up the question, as regards India, in our memorial to Lord Cross, which is printed in the Blue Book "Consumption of Opium in India." In that memorial we included other narcotic drugs, owing to what we heard of the evils arising from the sale of hemp drugs. That branch of the question has since been dealt with by the Society I just now referred to,—the Anglo-Indian Temperance Society so that it has passed out of our hands. With regard to India, we have had evidence from India that there is a desire on the part of at least a very considerable section of the Indian people that protection such as is given to our own people at home by our Pharmacy Act should be extended to India. We have had during the last two winters visits from India. Miss Soonderbai Powar has addressed a large number of meetings, and has represented a very strong feeling on the part of the women in her part of India, desiring suppression. You will, I hope, hear her evidence at Bombay or Poona. Then Mr. Raju Naidu came from Madras, representing a similar feeling there. I have a brief list of public meetings held in India. A great representative public meeting was held at Bombay in April, 1891, on the eve of Sir Joseph Pease's motion, presided over by the Bishop of Bombay. It was an enthusiastic gathering, and they adopted a memorial in support of his

motion, the result of which was telegraphed to him in time for him to read it to the House of Commons. A few days after, a great public meeting was held, at Dacca, which also was a most enthusiastic meeting, where all classes of native opinion were represented. At Madras, Bombay, and Poona great public meetings were held, which were attended by the leading Native gentlemen of the place. There was a remarkable petition from 227 opium drunkards at Bombay, begging that the dens might be closed, and that they might be protected from the habit.

Q.—*Sir William Roberts*—Was the object of these meetings with reference to opium-smoking or with reference to opium-eating?

A.—I do not know that the distinction was clearly made: it may have been in some cases, but I think not generally. I think one may say generally at all these meetings, and in the petitions from India, that opium-smoking has been put to the front as being the most serious form of the vice, but that opium-eating has also been included in the condemnation and in the prayer for protection. Then there were two memorials—one signed by twenty thousand persons in India, and another later on, in January, 1892, with twenty-two thousand signatures; and there was a great Tamil petition in March, 1892, with forty thousand signatures. Some of these, I am afraid, do not appear in the Parliamentary Records simply because the signatures have been in Tamil, or some other language, and I understand the practice in the Petitions Office in the House of Commons is that they pass over signatures which they are unable to read, because they are not written in English. There have also been meetings at Jubbulpore, Agra, Sholapore, and at Igatpuri and at Tanna, both near Bombay. Then there was another meeting at Madras, and one or two other meetings in different parts of Bombay. Besides these, there have been a considerable number of meetings connected with Missionary Conferences, meetings of the Missionaries and the Native Christians, which have unanimously adopted resolutions. Some were large meetings, and others were meetings of the particular bodies only.

Q.—Were those resolutions which were passed resolutions directed against the use of opium or against the public houses, or divans or dens in which opium is used?

A.—I think against the sale of opium: that was always the objective of the petitions.

Q.—*Chairman.*—Have you anything further to say upon paragraph nine?

A.—I should like to refer to the closing words of the paragraph : "whose remuneration in no degree depends on the amount of their sales." In that item I admit that we go beyond the principles which are in force under the Pharmacy Act in England ; but then the conditions of India and England are very different. No one would suppose that chemists in England would be likely to be tempted to betray their trust by reason of the profit they would make on the sale of poison. Public opinion is too strong, and that is, after all, the real sanction of our law in England. A chemist who carelessly sold a large dose of opium with the result that fatal consequences ensued, would be brought before a Coroner's inquest and would be gravely reprimanded.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall.*—Fatal consequences do not occur every day ?

A.—No, but a case of that kind would bring a druggist in England under the censure of public opinion. That, I think, is the real sanction of the law at home. But in India it seems to me to be a very important principle to lay down that those who sell should not be remunerated in proportion to the amount of their sales. I look upon it as the essential vice of the licensing system in force in India, with regard to opium, to hemp drugs, and to alcohol, that it so strongly gives to the licensee a direct interest in his increasing sales. The Indian farming system is based upon the old system familiar to readers of the New Testament as that of the Publicans in the Roman Empire. The tax-gatherers gathered the taxes on their own account, and were responsible to the Government for paying in a certain quota. That is still the principle of the farming out of licenses in India. It seems to me that that principle is radically objectionable, and that, whatever means are adopted for the repression of the use of opium and these other dangerous articles, we should altogether steer clear of that wrong principle.

Q.—What wrong principle ?

A.—The principle of farming out the licenses.

Q.—*Sir William Roberts.*—I should like to ask you whether that does not include the condemnation of the Gothenburg system which is in favour in England ?

A.—On the contrary, under the Gothenburg system in Norway and Sweden the licensees have no interest in promoting the sale of spirituous liquors, and that is exactly what the supporters of that system urge as being the basis of its success.

Q.—I suppose you are aware that the municipalities get the profits to the business ?

A.—Yes, but not the vendors. That is the point: that the vendor has no interest in extending the sales.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall.*—You object very strongly to the farming system, that is the system of giving the shop in which to sell opium, or anything else, to the man who bids highest for it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The other system is to make over the opium at a very high price to the man who pays a mere licensing fee for it. Say, you make over the crude opium to a licensed vendor, and you charge, perhaps, twenty rupees a seer, a very high price: you make it over to the licensed vendor, who only pays, perhaps, a fixed fee for it, and he has to sell it. You are aware that the great objection to that system, as compared with the other system of giving him opium at a low price and making him pay a high fee for his license?

A.—That is not the alternative I had in my mind, or the alternative I should suggest.

Q.—Are you aware of the reason why it is done in India?

A.—I suppose it is the same reason which I think you have already stated for the minimum guarantee clause.

Q.—That is, if you depend upon giving Government opium to a man at a high price, it becomes at once his interest not to take the Government opium, but, wherever possible, to take smuggled opium in preference. The evil of that is not only that the Government loses revenue, but that we have to rely generally in India to a large extent for checking smuggling, and therefore for checking excessive consumption of cheaper opium, upon the self-interest of the contractors. The contractor being a monopolist for a certain town or certain tract of country, it is to his interest to stop smuggling and inform against smuggling as much as possible, if he is dealing with Government opium; but if he himself is dealing with illicit opium, or smuggled opium, he cannot afford to inform against other people, for the people of the country would soon know that he is doing it; and if he informs against the smugglers they will inform against him. That is the difficulty. It is easy, of course, for people in England to find fault with a system, but the officials out here know the Natives and know the country and know the position of things. They have for generations been working up these things, and they know the balance of good and evil of the different methods, and that has led them to decide upon what they think best. May I ask what is the system you propose?

A.—I think you are putting to me, if I may say so, two vicious systems—two systems which I should characterise as both intrinsically bad.

Q.—Give me your reasons why you think one of these systems is better than the other?

A.—I think one of the reasons why Government officials are apt to go wrong is that it is so difficult for them to go far enough back to root principles. You discuss two methods which have been applied, to both of which the same objection of principle applies; that you are giving an interest in some form or another to the vendor.

Q.—How would you avoid giving an interest to the vendor?

A.—I should say by selling entirely for Government profit.

Q.—That is, you would give the man a salary and put him in a shop, and say, "you must sell this opium and account to Government for the whole profit." Is that it?

A.—I think so.

Q.—*Chairman*—You utterly dislike the sale of opium under any system?

A.—Yes.

Q.—But if any other system had been adopted you probably would have attacked it?

A.—Probably; any system that does not aim at restricting opium to medical use.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall.*—At present you are putting forward an objection to an existing system and a preference for another system which you describe to be practically this, that you give a man opium, put him in a shop, or whatever you choose to call it, and tell him to sell on behalf of the Government, and account for the Government money?

Chairman.—I think the witness would not like to make himself responsible for recommending such a course. He wishes to recommend nothing but prohibition.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall.*—He was taking the farming. You would not recommend that system? Do you think it workable?

A.—No, I was going to say that I have been told by natives of India that there are already Government officials, employed in connection with Government dispensaries and other places of that kind, established about India, amply sufficient to supply the demand for opium for medical purposes, and that nothing would be easier than to make use of those

existing facilities for this purpose. That is what I have been informed, both before I came to India and since I have been in India.

Q.—You mentioned in your evidence a Miss Soonderbai Powar. Can you tell me if she is a Christian or a Hindu ?

A.—A Christian.

Q.—Educated by Missionaries ?

A.—Yes, her parents were Christians ; she was born in a Christian family.

Q.—I do not know whether you would take her evidence seriously as a matter of importance; do you put any serious weight upon her evidence ?

A.—Before she took part in any meetings I had informed myself about her from the best qualified person I knew, a Missionary, who had resided for many years in Bombay, and whose judgment I could thoroughly rely upon, and he told me that I might certainly accept her evidence as genuine.

Q.—Genuine no doubt, but is she not a young girl ?

A.—Certainly not.

Q.—*Chairman.*—Is she coming before us as a witness ?

A.—Yes, certainly, at Bombay or at Poona.

Q.—We now pass from India to Burma. In your tenth paragraph you urge that there should be no further delay in sanctioning throughout Burma the measures which have been so carefully elaborated by the Chief Commissioner, Sir Alexander Mackenzie. Have you anything to say upon the case of Burma in addition to what is contained in your general memorial ?

A.—I think I may very briefly say that there are just two points which we have further to urge with regard to Burma. In Lower Burma there has been established a Register for opium consumers, and as regards the Natives of the Burmese race no additions are to be made in future to that Register. That provision does not apply to the Chinese and other non-Burmese inhabitants of Burma. We advocate the extension of that rule to the Chinese and non-Burmese. Then, secondly, that Register is not in force in Upper Burma, and the Excise Report for Upper Burma two or three years ago stated that the nominal prohibition that exists of sale to Burmans is absolutely inoperative, because the Burmans can always obtain as much of the drug as they require under cover of the sale to non-Burmese. We therefore urge that the Register already in force in Lower Burma should be extended to Upper Burma as well.

Q.—Is that all you wish to say as regards Burma?

A.—Perhaps I ought to add a reference to our last memorial to Lord Kimberley. It was based on a telegram which appeared in the *Times* to the effect that the Chinese and other non-Burmans were not to be registered at all. That was not in accordance with the original rules as drafted by the Burmese Government; and we very strongly objected to the change. The *Times* telegram said, "This alteration will materially increase the difficulty of the policy of suppression, which are already almost insuperable." We memoralised Lord Kimberley in the hope that that modification, which the *Times* telegrams stated to have been introduced by the Government of India, should not be insisted upon. I do not know what the present position of the matter is. No doubt the Commission will have before it distinct evidence as to the rules which have been finally approved and passed.

Q.—Now we come to the Punjab. In paragraph eleven you urge that the Punjab system of licensing the cultivation of the poppy should be at once put an end to, and you further urge in support of that recommendation that "the prohibition of poppy culture has been already enforced by the Indian Government in 1879 as regards Lower Bengal and Orissa, as well as throughout Southern India, about 1860 in Assam, and at other dates elsewhere." You further say, "we are assured by competent witnesses that the Sikh people would generally welcome the adoption by Government of measures which would enable them to rid themselves of a habit which they recognize to be a debasing and injurious one." Have you anything to put before us in support of that prayer, and those references to the opinion and feeling of the Sikh people?

A.—I have nothing special to say on that, in view of the fact that the Commission will no doubt visit the Punjab and inquire for itself the opinion of the Sikh people. The Commission will get very much better information there than we were able to obtain in London.

Q.—That is no doubt the case. Now we turn to the twelfth paragraph. In that paragraph you refer to the possible financial objections to the policy of prohibition which you recommend, and you state as a matter of opinion that the people of England would be ready to make up any deficiency which might arise from the prohibition of the export trade in opium. At the same time you urge that much can be done to meet the loss from the opium revenue by greater economy and by the development of Indian resources, and you are also of opinion that if there were loss from the abolition of the cultivation of the poppy, there would be a

gain to the people of India from the cultivation of other productions and the general development of the soil. Have you anything to say upon that?

A.—I do not think I need occupy the time of the Commission on this paragraph because my views are so fully embodied in the little pamphlet I have already laid before the Commission entitled "Substitutes for the Opium Revenue."

Q.—*Chairman.*—We have carefully read it, and we recognise the ability with which the pamphlet has been prepared.

Q.—*Mr. Mowbray.*—You state here that you believe the people of England will be ready to make up the deficiencies. Would you mind telling us exactly what Lord Kimberley said to the deputation in reply to that paragraph?

A.—After quoting that passage of our memorial, Lord Kimberley said: "That you regard as a very important declaration; but I am bound to say that I have not the slightest reason to suppose that there will be any disposition on the part of the Treasury to place a heavy burden upon the tax-payers of this country for the purpose indicated. I do not think that there is any warrant for that. I am speaking as the Minister responsible for India now; and I do not think that such a proposition to the Treasury, no matter what the Government in power, would be likely to meet with a favourable response. The sum will be very large, not only to compensate the Indian Treasury but also to compensate those who produce the opium, and also the Native princes, who derive considerable sums from the growth of opium."

Q.—I also notice that the only one of your Vice-President who is in the House of Commons, who signs this memorial to Lord Kimberley, distinctly declines to pledge himself to that particular paragraph of the memorial?

A.—That is so. Sir Mark Stewart frankly said he could not agree with that statement.

Q.—Can you tell us upon what that particular paragraph in the memorial was based?

A.—First of all let me speak as regards our own Society. We have made this a part of our programme definitely ever since the year 1886. I put before the Commission the Statement of Facts and Principles adopted at the beginning of that year. I was at that time a member of the Executive Committee, and I took part in the Conference at which that statement was drawn up. We had a debate upon this particular point. The late Mr. Chesson very strongly urged that it was right and reasonable towards

India that we should express ourselves distinctly on the question. I supported him, and the paragraph to that effect was carried. I have mentioned in the prefaee of "*Substitutes for the Opium Revenue*" that the same view was even more solemnly reaffirmed in 1891, shortly after the debate in Parliament, at our annual meeting, when a Conferenee of members and friends of the society was held. In the evening a publie meeting was held whieh confirmed the decision of that Conference. I will read that resolution.

"This Conference of members and supporters of the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade hereby declares that, in advoeating the abolition of the Indian opium trade as a measure of national morality, it is strongly opposed to the imposition on the people of India of any oppressive taxation. Whilst urging upon the Government of India its obligation to effeet sueh retrenchment of needless expenditure and to carry out such measures for the development of Indian resources as may enable it to govern India efficiently without imposing any permanent or long-continued burden on the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, this meeting is in favour of such temporary pecuniary assistance being given by this country to the Indian Government as may be found requisite to enable India to bear the loss of the opium revenue, without adding to the burdens at present resting upon the people of that country."

The phrase "temporary pecuniary assistance" was commented upon by Mr. Gladstone in the late debate as being somewhat ambiguous. Our meaning was very clear. Certainly we have always attaehed to it the meaning of a grant and not a loan. Mr. Gladstone seemed to think that it might be a temporary loan to be repaid.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall* :—You mean a temporary grant.

A.—What I mean is explained later on : a grant spreading over a period of years ; but a grant, not a loan.

Q.—*Chairman* :—Mr. Gladstone contemplated the contingency that that loan might not be repaid. That made the material for his speech ?

A.—Yes ; I wished to clear that up.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall* :—In any case a grant would be temporary. The loss would be permanent, and the grant would be temporary, would it not ?

A.—Yes. We take the view that India ought to be able to pay for its own government without relianee upon an immoral trade, and

that therefore it is only a question of a few years to adjust the Government of India to the exigencies of morality.

Q.—*Mr. Mowbray* :—I am sure you will understand that I do not doubt for a moment that the Anti-Opium Society had expressed that wish. But I wish to illustrate that it had not been endorsed by the responsible Minister?

A.—I quite understand your object. That part of our programme has very frequently been put before the public in England. I have already spoken of enthusiastic public meetings which we have held during the last three or four years especially. Almost always when I have taken part in those meetings I have made this one of the special points,—that India could not reasonably be expected to bear the loss of giving up the China trade. Over and over again I have found that that sentiment was most cordially taken up by the meeting; that England, which two generations ago paid twenty millions sterling for the emancipation of the slaves, should not hesitate to come to the help of India, and make a grant of some kind for the purpose of putting an end to this immoral trade, without undue pressure on the tax-payers of India. I should like to narrate what occurred at one particular meeting at which I was not present; but of which I read the reports and had them supplemented by those who were present. It was a meeting held at Norwich. One of the members for Norwich, Mr. Colman, has for many years been a staunch supporter of our Society. The other member, Mr. Hoare, who had been asked to take part in the meeting, wrote a letter to the Chairman in which he drew attention to this phase of the question, expressing a doubt whether the British people would be willing to have an addition to the income-tax or in some other way to bear additional taxation in order to get rid of the trade. The point was taken up in speeches by two of Mr. Hoare's strongest supporters, I believe, two clergymen of the Church of England, who expressed themselves in very strong terms upon it. It was put into the resolution of the meeting, and, I was told, was most enthusiastically adopted. In face of this letter from Mr. Hoare, the meeting expressed its conviction that the British people would not hesitate to incur such a sacrifice in order to put down the opium traffic with China. I give that as one particular instance of a great many meetings at which the same point has been raised.

Q.—*Mr. Wilson* :—You have given us cases of these meetings which, of course, would usually be attended by those who were more or

less predisposed to favour anti-opium views? Have you any means of suggesting anything to us, as to how it would be received by the general bulk of the voters and tax-payers, of any tendency in English public opinion that would lead you to believe that it would be so accepted?

A.—These meetings are by no means exclusively composed of those who already have an interest in the opium question. During the last two years we have had the presence at our meetings of these deputations from India. The winter before last we had also a Chinese gentleman from Australia. The presence of these people has attracted a very large number of persons who were not previously informed on the question, but who came to listen to what was said, and they have been very enthusiastic in supporting us.

Q.—Would the general tendency of English people with reference to the moral and social questions lead you to take a hopeful view of what the average voters and tax-payers would say upon this question?

A.—Certainly. Of course, very great power now rests with the working classes; and it has been especially amongst the working classes that we have received responses to that sentiment. It is the rich people, who can afford it better, who have been more inclined to demur to the idea of increased taxation.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall*:—You say at the end of the paragraph that "stoppage of the trade in opium with China would probably give a powerful stimulus to the export of other Indian produce to that country." I want to ask whether you do not think it is the case, that if China took other exports in the place of opium, it would, as Mr. David McLaren, ex-President of the Chamber of Commerce in Edinburgh, seems to hope, rather take them from England than from India?

A.—I think it would benefit both countries in that way. I think that probably the Indian trade with China would be increased, and that the British trade with China would probably be still more increased.

Q.—At the end of the paragraph you refer to the loss of India by exchange, and you say you think that the stoppage of the trade in opium with China would be likely to diminish that loss. Do you still adhere to that opinion?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you explain on what ground?

A.—On the ground that the opium trade with China causes a very abnormal state of things, *viz.*, that the balance of trade between India and China is very largely adjusted by means of actual specie payments. At page 25 of *Substitutes for the Opium Revenue* will be seen the figures showing the net importation of silver,—putting aside gold. The net imports of silver from China (Hong-Kong and Treaty Ports) to India, after deducting exports to China from India, amount to an average of over one and-half millions a year. In 1890-91, the net imports from China to India amounted to Rx. 3,545,518 in silver in order to adjust the trade. Mr. Hanbury obtained specific information from a banker in London, engaged in the Eastern trade, that the heavy drain of Silver in that year very materially and manifestly affected the value of the rupee sending it down considerably. In that year there had to be such a large import of silver from China and from the Straits in order to pay for the Indian opium that the Government, I feel no doubt lost by the depreciation of the rupee from that cause at least half its real net gain from opium.

Q.—You know that India annually owes a balance to England?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And she meets that balance in large part by transferring the debt which China owes to her for opium?

A.—Yes.

Q.—That being the case, how could the stoppage of that trade improve the difficulty of exchange between England and India, which is the difficulty we are talking about?

A.— It would minimize this drain of silver. The drain of silver would have to be very much greater than it in fact is if it were not for that circumstance.

Q.—We are talking of loss to India by exchange. How can the change of a method by which India settles part of her debt to England get rid of the difficulty of the loss by exchange?

A.—It may be that there would be some counteracting influence of the kind in connection with the balance of exchange, but I do not think that that can counterbalance the depression of the exchange which must result from this great inflow of silver from China to India.

Sir James Lyall:—I am not an expert like Sir David Barbour: but I agree with him in not being able to understand your argument.

Q.—*Chairman*:—In so far as the balance of trade between India and China fails to be adjusted by bills of exchange, and is adjusted by exporta-

tion of silver from China to India, to that extent you say there is an influence tending to depreciate the value of silver in India?

A.—Yes; and I would point out further in reference to what Sir James Lyall put to me, that if the poppy were not grown, there would be a greater cultivation of cereals and other products. You must not assume that the whole value of the opium crop would disappear. There would be some considerable value to be put in its place by some substituted crop. With regard to the estimate of the total value to India of the poppy crop which was put before the Commission by Sir John Strachey, and which is embodied in Mr. Batten's paper in the Society of Arts Journal, I think it was suggested to him at the time that that is obviously a grossly exaggerated statement, because it proceeds on the assumption that if there were no poppy crop the land would be absolutely unproductive.

Q.—*Mr. Pease*:—And the labour?

A.—And the labour.

Q.—*Chairman*:—You would, of course, admit that if the export of opium to China from India ceased, and India failed to create another export trade with China of equal value, that India's position as regards the rate of exchange would be prejudicially affected?

A.—I suppose it would to some extent.

Q.—Now we turn to the last point with which I think you wish to deal *viz.*, the monthly auction sales of opium in Calcutta. In your 13th paragraph you cite some eminent names of Indian Administrators, who have expressed their objection to the system of the monthly auction sales. You refer to Lord Lawrence, Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Herbert Edwardes, Sir Donald Macleod, and Sir William Muir. At the same time, you fairly admit that most of these eminent men, while expressing their objection to the monthly auction sales at Calcutta, were favourable to the substitution of a system in Bengal, similar to that which exists in Bombay. Your Association, as you have repeatedly told us, condemns both systems alike; but you seem, in reviewing these opinions to which you refer, to recognise that there is some ground for saying that the system which obtains in Bengal, the auction sales in Calcutta, do more particularly and strikingly identify the Indian Government with what you describe as an immoral traffic; and you urge that the total cessation of the sales which are now taking place in Calcutta could not fail to have the happiest results. Is there anything you would like to say in development of the views put forward in the paragraph to which I have refered?

A.—I should like to read to the Commission the statement of Sir Herbert Edwardes on that point as putting very strongly and clearly our

moral objections to the trade and summing up the whole case. I am now quoting from *The Friend of China, June, 1886* :—

"In the 'memorials of Sir Herbert Edwardes,' just published, there is given a paper, written by him after the great Mutiny of 1857, in which he points out what he believes to have been the national sins that drew down that national chastisement. After naming our withholding the Bible from the Natives, and other failures in Christian principle, he writes :—'Ninthly, I would name the connection of the Indian Government with the opium trade. This connection is fenced round with arguments nominally drawn from political economy, such as that the monopoly causes increase of price to the vicious consumer, and obtains the largest returns with smallest outlay of capital. But no theories can get rid of the following serious facts: that India grows opium for China; that opium is ruining the Chinese people; that wherever grown in India, Government is an interested party in it; that in Bengal it is actually grown for Government and for no one else; that Government advances immense sums of money yearly to enable the cultivators to grow it, and maintains a large staff of officials to collect the produce; that Government sells it to those who import it into China; that the vice of opium-smoking is so fatal to the vital and moral powers of individuals, and therefore to the prosperity of a nation, and has spread such heart-rending misery in China, that the Chinese laws forbid its importation, that English merchants nevertheless force and smuggle it into China,"' (this was written before the legalization) "'and are not prevented from so doing by the Government of England, which has formally engaged by treaty to prevent it;'" (I think, perhaps, there he has somewhat overstated the case) "'that all this was known to the Indian Government while growing opium or organizing its cultivation, and selling it to merchants who cannot legally get rid of it; that the very Chinese people, maddened with their laws and our own treaties, curse us openly for bringing this destroying poison to their shores; and, lastly, that exactly in proportion as opium-ruin spreads in China, so the opium-revenue of the Indian Government is increased. An honest, manly conscience cannot get over these facts. It will not the misled by a phrase chipped off from the only sound political economy, the common benefit of the human race, no matter in what country scattered. It will fasten instinctively on the truth that with the Indian Government this is a question of revenue; and in presence of the calamities of 1857, it will conclude that revenue such as this does not come to much good in the end. It will remember all the plausible excuses that were made for Negro slavery, and it will urge the nation which abolished man-selling in the West Indies

to abolish man-poisoning in the East, let the cost be what it will.'" Taking that as a true description of the trade, and of our objections to it, I think it will be seen that a proposal merely to put that trade into private hands, and whilst still continuing it, to derive a revenue from it, by means of an excise or license duty instead of by means of monopoly, is a wholly inadequate remedy, and does not meet the true moral objections to the trade.

Q.—*Mr. Wilson.*—Can you tell me who Sir Herbert Edwardes is, and what he knows about it.

A.—He was a distinguished Indian soldier and administrator.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall.*—With reference to your quotation from Sir Herbert Edwardes, writing about national sins, are you aware that at that time Sir Herbert Edwardes was inclined to be, what most people would think, a bit of a fanatic: that he included in national sins our toleration of the old endowments of Hindoo temples and Mahomedan mosques: he wanted to sweep them all away?

A.—I am aware that moral reformers, in advance of their age are generally considered fanatics.

Q.—*Chairman.*—The concluding paragraph of your memorial deals with China. I understand that you wish to call particular attention to the observations which you quote of Dr. Griffith John of the London Missionary Society?

A.—I will read the latter part of our quotation from Dr. John, who is very well known in the missionary world, as one of the most experienced and able of all the missionaries labouring in China. He says:—"But have the Chinese ability to put down the vice? As long as the Indian trade in opium exists, the hands of the Chinese Government are tied and paralyzed. They can simply do nothing but allow things to go on from bad to worse. Their best efforts, however sincere and energetic, would prove abortive. If the Indian trade in the drug were abandoned, the Chinese would, I firmly believe, make an honest effort to stop the native growth, and the attempt would eventuate at once in a diminution of the evil. It might eventuate ultimately in its complete suppression." In expressing those views in a careful, guarded form Dr. John agrees with some of the most weighty evidence given before the Commission in London by other experienced Chinese missionaries. Mr. Hudson Taylor spoke to the same effect—that he did not feel able absolutely to prophesy what the Chinese Government would do, but that he was clear that as long as the import from India goes on under sanction of the Treaty of 1858, so long the Chinese Government is helpless to deal with what it certainly recognizes as being a great national evil. Dr. Griffith John concludes with these

words—"But whether the Chinese Government can put down the native growth or not, our path as a Christian nation is plain enough. It is for us to wash our hands clean of the iniquity. The trade is immoral, and a foul blot on England's escutcheon. It is a disgrace to ourselves as a people, and unworthy of the place which we hold among the nations of the earth." I do not wish myself to speak too confidently of what will happen in China, and of how soon, or how quickly, or how effectually the Chinese Government may be able to put down this vice, which has obtained so great a hold of its people. The position of our Society is this, that however that may be, it is not for us to wait for the Chinese Government, hampered and fettered as it is, to take action, but that we ourselves should recognise that the trade is an immoral one, and that we should begin by wiping our hands of it. Then we should be free to exercise all the right diplomatic pressure that we could to help China to free herself from that evil. I have been longer a Member of the Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society than of the Anti-Opium Society; and it seems to me that there is a very clear precedent for British action, *viz.*, the part we took with regard to the slave trade. When we had abolished the slave trade ourselves, we proceeded to use all our influence diplomatically with the other nations of Europe, in order to get the trade put down in other countries as well. I hope we shall do the same with regard to the opium trade. When we have washed our own hands of it, we can rightly and properly help China to deal with this great evil which has grown up in her midst, and for the growth of which we nationally have so grave and serious a responsibility.

Q.—*Sir James Lyall.*—Have you considered the fact that the mono poly, and trade and revenue derived from it is all Indian, and that Indian people are primarily interested in it, and that the sentiments to which you appeal are English; I mean that the object of putting the English name right in the eyes of the Chinese, and facilitating the conversion of the Chinese to Christianity is an English object—have you considered that?

A.—Yes, I have. I think I cannot answer that better than in the words of Sir Edward Fry. Sir Edward Fry wrote three Essays on the opium question which appeared originally in the *Contemporary Review*, 1876-7-8. The first and, perhaps, the second were written when he was Mr. Fry, Q C., and the last after he had been made a Judge. He deals with that argument thus:—"An argument against interfering with the opium revenue, somewhat to the following effect, is often urged

or suggested : 'It is very well,' it is said, 'for you to assume this high moral tone about the opium revenue ; the revenue is not yours, but belongs to India, and with it England has nothing to do. To abolish the traffic is to throw some nine millions" (the amount was much greater than it is now) "more of annual taxation on the already over-taxed population of India, and that for a scruple of some weak-minded philanthroispts in England. Pray pay for your own philanthropy, and do not make another country pay for it.' Let us consider this objection a little, and let us note, in the first place, that it may be taken to concede the justness of the objection to the revenue ; it only objects to the person of the objector." Then there is a passage which I need not read. Here is the answer—"India is as it were, a minor, under the guardianship of England, and England is a trustee for India in the administration of Indian affairs. But in taking upon ourselves that burden and that duty, we have incurred no obligation to do for India what we might not lawfully do for ourselves. If in the course of our trusteeship we have sold a poison wickedly for the gain of a minor, are we bound to continue so to do ? Have we lost the right of repentance because our sin is to some one else's benefit ? India cannot change the policy, for she is in tutelage ; England cannot change the policy, for she is a trustee ; therefore the sin must go on for ever. Is that sound reasoning ?"

Q.—*Sir William Roberts.*—May I ask if your Society takes the same attitude with regard to alcohol as it does with regard to opium ?

A.—A good many members of our Society are active prohibitionists; but the Society as a whole consists of men who unite on this opium question, although they differ upon all sorts of other questions in politics, in religion, and in regard to temperance question. I think all would be in favour in some degree of prohibition, but I doubt whether all the members of our Society would support the policy of the United Kingdom Alliance.

Chairman.—That I believe concludes your evidence. We have to thank you for the clear manner in which you have put us in possession of the views of the Association which you represent, and we recognise the efforts that you have personally made in the cause which has commended itself to you. Naturally, it has been your duty, entertaining the views that you do, to say many things which are not accepted, at any rate by some members of this Commission, but I am sure that we shall all feel that what you have put before us has been put before us with the utmost

sincerity of purpose, and we all appreciate that in the encounter in which you are engaged with the Government of India upon its own ground, you are placed in circumstances of no ordinary difficulty.

Witness.—There is one point that we did not deal with in our memorial and which has come under my notice since I came to India. it is with regard to the system under which the poppy is grown in the Behar district.

Q.—*Chairman.*—I think it would be appropriate to deal with that when we get to that district.

Printed by
Joseph Culshaw, for the Methodist Publishing House, Calcutta.

H Pam. Drugs Opium

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part V. 24th November, 1893.

PRICE ONE PENNY, or ONE ANNA, for each part.

Published by the
SOCIETY FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE OPIUM TRADE
BROADWAY CHAMBERS, LONDON, S. W.
Also at the
METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, 45, DHARAMTALA ST., CALCUTTA.

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Mr. A. F. Finlay, Secretary to the Government of India.

Q.—Will you state, in order that it may be placed on the minutes, what your position is?

A.—I am Secretary to the Government of India in the Financial Department. I attend this morning for the purpose of producing, on behalf of the Government of India, five papers, of which copies have already been handed in to the Secretary to the Commission. The first is a statement of the public revenue and expenditure in British India under all heads of account; the second is a note regarding opium produced or consumed in India; the third is a note regarding the arrangements with the Native States regarding the opium; the fourth is an account of previous proposals for placing the Government monopoly of the cultivation, manufacture, and sale of opium in Bengal; the fifth is a reprint of a report and statement on a report on opium in Western China by Mr. W. D. Spence, Her Britannic Majesty's Consul, dated 11th April, 1882.

The President intimated that as the members of the Commission had not had time to study all these papers which had been in the hands of the Secretary for only a day or too, and Mr. Finlay desired that the statements contained in those papers should be the evidence-in-chief on the part of the Government of India, with reference to the various matters dealt with in these papers, it was proposed to reserve till Monday or Tuesday next the explanations which Mr. Finlay might wish to give in answer to questions which might be put to him by any members of the Commission. Mr. Finlay said he also produced the papers relating to the confidential circular issued in the North-West provinces, in the Abkari Department, regarding the smoking of *chundoo* in clubs or dens which the Commission desired to have.

Baboo Ram Darlabh Mazumdar's evidence.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Will you state your position and occupation?

A.—I am a pleader of Nowgong in Central Assam, and have experience, with regard to the opium question, of the Assam people generally, over a period of eighteen years. As a pleader I have had opportunities of meeting persons of every nationality and of every

creed, caste, and colour ; we have our domestic labourers and servants from people of the Hindu and aboriginal tribes.

Q.—What is yonr experience with regard to the consumption of opium ?

A.—A large number of persons consume opium in the district in which I am. Smoking is prevalent among the *Makies* and *Hazais*.

Q.—What position of life do the *Makies* and *Hazais* occupy ?

A.—They are a barbarous people, and live mostly on the hills. Smoking is not prevalent among people of position, but the eating and drinking of opium is.

Q.—Can you give us an idea of the percentage of the adult population who have the opium habit ?

A.—It would be about twenty-five per cent of the whole population, including foreigners.

Q.—Can you give us an idea as to the age at which the opium habit is contracted generally ?

A.—They begin the habit at the age of sixteen or eighteen, when they are in a position to earn money. Some are taught to eat opium in early childhood, some take it as a cure for rheumatism, and also in cases of dysentery.

Q.—Can you give us any idea of the people who take opium as a cure for disease ?

A.—No, I cannot.

Q.—Have you information that it is given by mothers to their children ?

A.—Yes, in the district in which I live, women form the greatest portion of the labouring community ; they do seventy-five per cent of the domestic and field work, and they give small doses of opium to their children to keep them quiet while the mothers are out at work.

Q.—Have you information as to those who have acquired the habit ever giving it up ?

A.—I know the case of a pleader who is a neighbour of mine ; he was in the habit of smoking opium, but he gave it up.

Q.—Are there many who give it up ?

A.—People find a difficulty in doing so, and do not give it up unless compelled. Many take it to excess.

Q.—What proportion of their income do habitual consumers spend on opium ?

A.—From ten to twenty-five per cent.

Q.—Do you find that there is any tendency to increase the dose ?

A.—Yes, those who have acquired the habit increase the dose.

Q.—What is the effect on these people of the consumption of opium ?

A.—The people are growing weak and indolent, and are unfit for much physical labour. There is a vast difference between those who take opium and those who do not, in their physical appearance.

Q.—Is opium assumed to be a protection against fever.

A.—I have never heard of it.

Q.—Can you tell us of the complaints for which opium is used ?

A.—It is used for rheumatic pains, and some times in cases of diarrhœa.

Q.—What is used as a preventive of fever in malarial places ?

A.—Quinine and chinchona. As far as I know, opium is never prescribed for fever.

Q.—Do you think it is necessary for the working classes to take opium to enable them to do their work.

A.—No, I don't think so.

Q.—Is the habit of taking opium looked upon as disgraceful ?

A.—Among the rising generation it is considered discreditable.

Q.—Do you mean that it is a disgrace to young people to take it ?

A.—Young people who are being educated look upon it as disgraceful.

Q.—What is the effect of the licensing system on the sale of opium in Assam ?

A.—I think it operates rather as an inducement to the people to take opium. Licenses are given so freely that opium is placed at the very doors of the people. In the district of which I am speaking there are about two hundred licenses, if not more.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to make with regard to the course Government ought to take in regard to the granting of opium licenses ?

A.—The licenses should be reduced to as small a number as practicable without giving much trouble to those who want it.

Q.—Do you think the law has been fully carried out in your locality ?

A.—I think it is carried out—I mean the opium law.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to make with regard to the prohibition of smoking?

A.—Smoking should not be allowed on the premises of licensed shops. If it could be stopped altogether, it would be a very good thing.

Q.—Is it your opinion that the sale of opium should be prohibited except for medical purposes?

A.—I think it should be; but I don't think it practicable in the present state of the country.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to make with regard to a substitute for the loss of revenue?

A.—Tobacco should be taxed; it is extensively used, and is a luxury.

Q.—Have you anything to say in regard to the way in which opium can be sold for medical purposes?

A.—Licenses should be used under the strict supervision of the police, and the licensees should keep a register of the people to whom they sell the opium in the same way as is done under licenses for the sale of arms and ammunition. If practicable, certificates should also be registered from medical men.

Q.—Should there be any supervision over those who should be licensed?

A.—I think police supervision would be sufficient.

Q.—Are you aware whether there is any smuggling in your district?

A.—There is no smuggling of opium into the district. I have heard of cases of smuggling in other districts.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—You refer in your printed statement to some thing which you call black fever. What is that fever?

A—It is called malarial fever by medical men, and is extensively prevalent in the district.

Q.—Is Nowgong a large place?

A.—It is a small town, and is the head quarters of the district.

Q.—You say that people smoke and eat opium in the licensed shop in Nowgong. Is that done in all the shops?

A.—There is only one opium shop in Nowgong. It is a *chundoo* shop.

Q.—Is there any arrangement somewhere in that shop by which the people can lie down and smoke *chundoo* ?

A.—They smoke it in the shop or hut where the *chundoo* is sold. The whole place consists of a single hut.

Q.—If I went there to buy *chundoo*, should I see people smoking there ?

A.—If you buy at the shop *outside*, you will not see the smoking ; but if you go inside the hut, you will see it.

Q.—How many smoke there at a time ?

A.—About twenty or twenty-five.

Q.—You say smoking on the premises should be stopped. By whom should it be stopped ?

A.—By the authority of the Magistrate.

Q.—Does not the law now prohibit the smoking of opium on the premises ?

A.—No : it is understood that they should smoke on the premises.

Q.—But there may be a difference between the law and the practice. Are you aware of any law prohibiting smoking on the premises ?

A.—No, I am not. The Opium Act of 1878 and the Chief Commissioner's Rules do not prohibit it. As a pleader, I get cases of breaches of the opium law, but I never heard of a prosecution for smoking opium on the premises.

Q.—Could a prosecution be instituted ?

A.—I don't think so. If it could, the police would have taken the matter in hand.

Q.—Are you acquainted with the Blue Book on the Consumption of Opium in India ?

A.—I have read parts of it.

Q.—Have you seen the statement made there by the Commissioner of Excise in Assam under date the 2nd December 1890 (page twenty-eight), in which he states positively that there are no opium smoking dens there, and that opium is not consumed on the premises of licensed vendors : that there is no room into which a purchaser is entitled to enter, or into which he can go and rest, if so inclined, and that as there is not a single opium den there, it is not necessary to make any change in the law.

A.—Yes, but that is qualified by a letter from Mr. Luttman Johnson, Commissioner of the Assam Valley District, to the Chief Commissioner

of Assam (page thirty of the same book), in which he says, speaking of the proposal to make a change in the law, that opium is often smoked on the premises ; that he would not mind closing those shops, as such a measure would make no change in the habits of the people ; that the few people who visit those shops were chiefly foreigners, and would be able to make their own arrangements for smoking.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Are you aware that by a resolution of the Finance Department dated 25th September, 1891, the Government of India directed that when a license expires, a clause should be inserted prohibiting the consumption of opium on the premises in any form. Therefore if licenses have been issued in accordance with that resolution the owners of the licenses are breaking the law by allowing smoking on the premises ?

A.—At the time of sale the purchaser of a license is not told that he is not authorised to allow his customers to consume opium on the premises.

Q.—Is it not stated in the license ?

A.—I have not seen the licenses.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—The passages I have read to you from the Blue Book show that the Excise Commissioner speaking of the whole Province said that the consumption of opium was not allowed on licensed premises, but Mr. Luttman Johnson, Commissioner of the Assam Valley District, speaking of one portion of the Province, said that there are many shops in which the smoking of opium took place, what have you to say on the point ?

A.—I say that Mr. Luttman Johnson was right, at least in respect of the town of Nowgong.

Q.—In reply to question twenty-five, as to the desirability of prohibiting the sale of opium except for medical purposes, you said that the people would be indifferent. I don't understand how you say it is not practicable, and yet that the people would be indifferent ?

A.—The population as a whole would not object to it, only those who consume would raise a cry.

Q.—Then with reference to smuggling, if there is any smuggling, where does the smuggled opium come from ?

A.—In the district where I am, I am not aware of any case of smuggling into the district.

Q.—Then, what do you know in reference to Calcutta and the N.-W. Provinces.

A.—I have heard of cases of smuggling into the province of Assam, and I have heard that the smuggled opium comes either from Calcutta or the N.-W. Provinces. Opium is cheap in Calcutta, but the price in Assam is Rs. thirty-seven per seer. There would be great gain by selling it retail.

Q.—Do you consider the district of which you are speaking, a very malarious district?

A.—Yes, it is.

By Mr. Mowbray—When was it that you saw those shops where there were people smoking opium on the premises?

A.—Some time in August last.

Q.—What did you say in answer to Mr. Wilson with regard to the price of opium in Assam?

A.—In Assam opium is sold by the Government at Rs. thirty-seven per seer.

Q.—That is the price at which the licensed vendors buy it from the Government, and what is the price at which they sell it?

A.—They sell it at from Rs. forty-five to Rs. fifty per seer. The price has increased lately. It has increased by Rs. five per seer this year. I am speaking of the price to the consumer charged by retail vendors.

Q.—You say that licenses are given too freely. You are aware that the number of licenses in Assam has been very much reduced during the last ten years?

A.—I should think that the number has not been reduced very much. It had been reduced from 208 to 197 or 198.

Q.—Are you aware that, according to the figures furnished to us by the Government of India, the number of shops for the retail sale of opium has been reduced between 1883 and 1892 from 1,380 to 866, and that the number of shops for the retail sale of *madak* and *chundoo* in Assam has been reduced from thirty-seven to sixteen?

A.—I cannot say. There was only one shop in the town where I live, and it is there still.

Q.—Assuming the figures which have been been put in by the Government of India to be correct, do they not show a considerable reduction in the number of licenses during the last ten years?

A.—They show a reduction; but there is still room for further reduction.

Q.—You told us there would be no general feeling against prohibition; do I understand your remark to apply to opium-smoking only, or to opium-eating as well?

A.—It applies to opium-smoking and eating. The majority of the population will not mind the prohibition.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—Have you any experience of district life or is your experience confined to the town of Nowgong ?

A.—I have not much experience in villages.

Q.—What length of standing have you as a pleader ?

A.—Thirteen years in that district. My experience is mainly limited to the town of Nowgong itself and to the district. There is very little difference between the town and the interior of the district. The people residing in the town are as much cultivators as those in the interior. Nowgong itself is something like a village.

Q.—Have you had the means of ascertaining the views of those who consume opium ?

A.—They would be against the prohibition.

Q.—I think you said that quinine is ordinarily used as a preventive against fever ; whence do the Assam people get the quinine ?

A.—If they went to the charitable dispensary they would get it free of cost.

Q.—You are not aware that the Post Office has lent its aid to the Government to sell quinine at the Post Offices ?

A.—I am not aware that that is the case in Assam.

Q.—Is there any likelihood of the people taking largely to quinine ?

A.—I cannot speak positively on that point.

Q.—You say that there is no law against opium-smoking on the premises of licensed vendors ?

A.—I think so.

Q.—Do you mean that there is no order of the Government in the Excise Department directing the prohibition ?

A.—In the Opium Act there is no provision, and I am not aware that there is any Government order on the subject.

Q.—What is ordinarily smoked in Assam, is it *madak* or *chandoo* ?

A.—I believe it is *chandoo*.

Q.—What you referred to was this particular shop where there is smoking of opium ?

A.—Yes.

Evidence of the Hon'ble R. D. Lyall, C. S. I., Member of the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces.

By the President :—Q.—For how long have you served in this country and in what districts ?

A.—I have served in this country for over thirty-two years. Most of my service as a young man was in East Bengal, in the districts of Backergunge, Tippera, Faridpur, and Dacca. In this last district I served nearly sixteen years as Assistant Magistrate, Subdivisional Officer, Joint-Magistrate, Collector, and Officiating Commissioner.

Q.—What opportunities have you had of forming a judgment as to the effects of using opium ; did you see anything of the Chinese ?

A.—When Subdivisional Officer of the Munshigung subdivision, Narayangunge, which was then largely frequented by Chinese junks, was under me. I also, as Collector, kept excise administration in my own hands. Subsequently, after my return from furlough, I was Inspector-General of Police for about three years, and Collector of the twenty-four Parghannas and Officiating Commissioner of the Presidency Division for about two years. I was then for nearly seven years Commissioner of the Chittagong Division, and after my return from second furlough, I was appointed Commissioner of the Patna Division, whence I was transferred to the Board of Revenue, where I have been in charge of among others, the Excise and Opium Departments. I have thus knowledge, more or less, of the whole province, but chiefly of East Bengal.

Q.—What is the opinion you have formed of the effects of the habit upon those who use it?

A.—My experience is that opium is far the least hurtful of the three principal sources of excise revenue in Bengal, viz., opium, *ganja*, and alcohol. As regards its effects on the natives of the country, I hold the moderate use of opium to be beneficial in a malarious country like Bengal, and cases of immoderate use are very few and far between. Nor does even immoderate use of opium cause such bad effects as the immoderate use of alcohol. I can assert that I know no case in all my long residence in India in which I can say that I believe the death of any native has been due to immoderate habitual use of opium, while I know very many cases in which death has been due to the excessive use of alcohol. A native who takes to alcohol, more particularly in its European forms, almost invariably takes to it in excess. This is not the case with opium, among Bengalis at least. It is said to be different with Burmese; but

from what I saw of them in Chittagong, especially in the Cox's Bazar subdivision, I was not able to come to the conclusion that in this respect Burmese differed from Bengalis. When I was Subdivisional Officer of Munshigunge, and later on Collector of Dacca, many Chinese junks used to come to Narayangunge, and I studied the effect of opium on the Chinese sailors. Some of these took opium in very large quantities and used to lie in a state of stupefaction, but next day these men were fit for their work, and did just as much as the abstainers and moderate smokers. This greatly impressed me, as I had come out with the usual ideas one gains in England that opium ruins a man body and soul, and I was so fully convinced that opium did these men no harm, that when I was Collector of Dacca, I proposed that they should be allowed to buy a seer each man to take with them for the homeward voyage, and this was sanctioned. I think De Quincey is largely responsible for the general acceptance of the view that opium is so very harmful, and possibly when it is taken in the form of laudanum it is more deleterious, and creates a greater craving than when taken, as it usually is here, in pills.

Q.—What is the effect of opium as regards its leading up to crime?

A.—Opium never leads to crime of any kind so far as my experience goes. It does not make a man quarrelsome or violent, but calms and soothes him, and in this respect its effects differ entirely from those of alcohol and *ganja*.

Q.—What is the real effect of opium from a medicinial point of view?

A.—The use of opium in Bengal is to a very large extent medical. It is used to keep off fever, and is the only excised article which a good Mahommedan can use for this purpose. It is, therefore, largely used in the malarious districts of the Burdwan Division, in Orissa, in Chittagong, Murshidabad, Rungpore, and Malda, and also in Calcutta and the districts round it. The consumption in Calcutta is very large, partly owing to the number of Chinamen here, partly owing to their being a larger number of immoderate consumers here among the Mahommedans than elsewhere, but also because it is more largely used by the respectable classes of natives, chiefly by men over forty, than it is in the mofussil. This is generally done under medical advice, and no stigma attaches itself to the consumer's character. I may mention, as showing that connexion with the Opium Department is not held as involving any moral stain on those serving in it, that the son of Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen, the great Brahmo reformer, and brother of the Maharani of Kuch Behar, and the son of Mahamahopadhyaya Mohesh Chundra Nyaratna, C. I. E., Principal of the Sanscrit College, and an orthodox Hindoo, are both in the Opium

Department. There are also two Mahommedan gentlemen of good family in the Department.

Q.—What is the use of it as a physical enjoyment?

A.—I consider its effects very limited indeed. Ordinarily I should say that its consumption in Bengal is in no way immoderate.

Q.—Do you think it possible that opium may be taken in limited quantities as an indulgence, in the same sense as wine, without moral harm?

A.—Such are my views.

Q.—What do you say in regard to the growth of the poppy and manufacture and sale of opium being prohibited.

A.—With reference to the argument that we forced opium on the Chinese, I think that is pretty well exploded. Mr. Alexander, in his evidence on the point, has chiefly referred to matters of ancient history. Now, Indian opium is simply used in China as the higher class Havana cheroots are used in England, or as Indian tea is used along with China tea. In the first case the Mandarins of North China and Pekin use the more expensive Indian opium, just as a rich man at home smokes an expensive cigar, and in the latter it is used to bring up the quality of the indigenous opium, but its use in this respect is steadily declining, owing to the improvement in the home-grown drug; and I am informed by men who know China that, whereas formerly seventy-five per cent of Indian opium was ordinarily required to mellow the indigenous drug, twenty-five per cent now suffices to produce an equal article. The Indian drug is a milder and less harmful drug than the Persian, containing as it does less morphia and more narcotine. I confess I fail to see any immorality in such a trade, and the opponents of the present system seem to be on the horns of a dilemma. If opium is bad, then surely it is better to have it under Government control and to restrict the production, as is now done; while if it is good, then why this outcry against it? Even if, for the sake of argument, it be allowed to be possible to forbid the growth of opium altogether, such probibition would be a gross political error or even danger; but it is impossible to allow it to be grown for medical purposes, and for no other.

Q.—Do you think that actual prohibition would lead to smuggling?

A.—I believe that total prohibition and prevention for anything but medical purposes would lead to smuggling, and it would be impossible to draw the line between medical and other purposes. Such half-and-half restriction would simply lead to smuggling, and it would also be

impossible to draw the line between its use for medical purposes and for pleasure only, In place of opium shops we should have the retail of opium by *hakims* and *kobirajes* and *pansaris*, and supervision would be more difficult than at present. Total restriction would mean smuggling from Native States and increased use of alcohol and *ganja*—both, as I have already stated, more hurtful than opium. Sir Ashley Eden, than whom no better authority exists, said that the cost of a preventive service would be absolutely prohibitory.

Q.—What would be the political effect of abolition ?

A.—I hold further, that in a political point of view total prohibition would be so dangerous, and would alienate so large a body of Her Majesty's subjects in India, as to be impossible. No good Mahommedan can take spirituous or fermented liquors, while he may take opium. If opium is prohibited, the opium-consuming Mahommedans will be driven either to spirits, to take which is contrary to their religion, or to *ganja*, which is physically more injurious. The dissatisfaction would be enormous, and I am not prepared to say that, fanned as it would be by professional agitators, it would not amount to disaffection and require the presence of more British troops in India. It would, in fact, arouse much the same feelings as any real attempt to "rob a poor man of his beer" would do in England. There is also another danger, not confined to any class, and that is, the total inability of the Native mind to grasp the fact of the possibility of the present agitation being without some motive. They cannot conceive that any body of intelligent human beings can go in for a crusade against what they have always held to be a harmless article out of which a large revenue is realized without their being called on to pay it, and not have some motive in the background ; and in this case the motive is supposed to be the spread and increase of the sale of imported European liquors. The same idea was started when the discussion took place in Lord Mayo's time, and is referred to in Sir E. Baring's (Lord Cromer's) note and it was mentioned to me the other day by an intelligent Native gentlemen.

Q.—What do you think would be the disposition of the people of India with reference to restriction as regards its use for non-medical purposes ?

A.—I think people would object to this restriction. My experience, as above stated, is chiefly in East Bengal ; but I have seen a good deal of Sikhs, Goorkhas, and other opium consumers, particularly Goorkhas. In the Lushai Hills Expedition, opium was regularly served out to the opium consumers, and the men who consumed it did the same work as

their comrades, and bore the hardships as well, if not better. One great advantage of opium in campaigns, as compared with alcohol, is its small bulk and consequent easy carriage. Thinking natives of India say with truth, What right has England, which raises so large a revenue from spirits, wine, and beer, to come and try and stop our comparatively innocent equivalent? and any legislation in this direction would be viewed with great disfavour.

Q.—Should the prohibition policy be adopted, there would be a serious loss of revenue; money must be had to carry on the Government, and this would mean increased taxation, what view do you take in reference to the disposition of the people to accept that alternative?

A.—On this point there is, I believe, absolute unanimity. Even the few organs of public opinion that favour prohibitive measures, say that the loss to the revenue should be made good by economy here and by reducing the home charges; but the utmost economy could not produce five to seven millions, and that sum would be required, or, in fact, more in case the dissatisfaction amounted to disaffection. The bulk of the people of India are poor; not poor in the sense of the poor in England, but living from hand to mouth, though in a state of fair comfort and with very few hopeless paupers; and being thus poor, they cannot stand direct taxation. which is also specially bad in India because so much of direct taxation fails to reach the State coffers. The only alternative would be to double the salt tax, and I fancy the strongest anti-opiumist would hesitate to propose this. In his evidence Bishop Thoburn has suggested a tobacoo tax. This would be a must expensive tax to realise, and it would fall on exactly the same class as the salt tax. Almost every man, woman and child in India consumes tobacco, and if taxation of this kind is to be imposed, it would be infinitely better to double the salt tax, which is easily collected at a minimum of cost. I fail entirely, however, to see the equity of prohibiting men from using opium which they are willing to pay for, and taxing non-opium consumers to make up the deficit. There are some who, while willing to see opium grown and exported, object to Government having more to do with this than the mere levy of duty, and such would have Government withdraw from all active participation in the growth and manufacture of opium and deal with Bengal opium as Malwa opium is now dealt with.

Q.—I believe you came prepared to make a statement with reference to the Bengal monopoly system, but it is not necessary that I should trouble you upon the point, as I understand that the view of those members of the Commission whose opinion in this respect we are specially

bound to consider is that that monopoly is not so much objected to as the opium traffic itself. You were present when Mr. Alexander gave his evidence, and if you desire to do so, you may have this opportunity to make any observations in regard to that evidence.

A.—I do desire to add a few words regarding Mr. Alexander's evidence. In the first place, I would desire to put on record the fact that has, no doubt, attracted the attention of the members of the Commission that his evidence deals very largely—in fact almost exclusively—with ancient history, more especially as regards the attitude of China. Next, I would note that paragraph thirteen of the memorial identifies the Society's objects with the spread of Christianity. The Government of India is a government by Christians strictly pledged to religious neutrality, and it would be most dangerous and opposed to the most solemn pledges if Government in any way moved from this attitude. Mr. Alexander also stated that excise opium was more intoxicating than medical opium. The opium is the same, the only difference being that the medical opium is selected, and that it is dried in the laboratory, and not in the sun. The reason of Indian opium not competing with Turkey opium in England is that the price paid even for Turkey opium in England is less than the price realized in India for opium. If we competed, the price of Indian opium would be lower than that of the Turkey drug, as the Indian opium contains less morphia. With regard to farming licenses, I would only remark that in practice we find it impossible to put on a sufficiently high selling price in some districts. The range is from Rs. sixteen per seer in the Patna Division to Rs. thirty-two in Orissa. Communications have so improved that smuggling is easy, and the profit on a seer bought at Patna and smuggled to Calcutta is Rs. twelve. In Chittagong, with the help of the farming system, the price in the south of the district has been raised as high as Rs. fifty to seventy. That was done to prevent smuggling into Burma. Another point that requires notice is that, so far as I could understand, the Anti-Opium Society has not distinguished between the smoking and the eating of opium, as I think it should have done. All the arguments regarding China refer to smoking, and not to eating. In India, opium is almost entirely eaten; and all that has been said really relates to eating, not smoking. I also desire to draw attention to a memorial from the Rev. Mr. Phillips, which was sent to me by the Government of Bengal. I desire to make a few remarks upon it. The note, as originally drawn up, contained two extracts from a private letter, and which I now desire to withdraw. A revised statement has been circulated.

Mr. Wilson pointed out that this was very unusual. They were supplied with copies of the memorial, and it was immediately afterwards withdrawn; consequently he had not read it. He would like to have an opportunity of looking it over before questions were put on it.

By the President.—I shall not ask you any questions on it to-day; on Tuesday we may do so.

Witness continued.—I have to add one or two words with reference to the evidence which has been given since. About the decay of old Mahommedan families, which was referred to, I desire to say that the decay is not peculiar to Moorshedabad, and extends all over Bengal. To my certain knowledge, the decay is due to their lagging behind the Bengalis in education, and in their general ability to conduct their own business. Most of the old families allow their estates to fall into the management of the more cultured Hindu, who gradually ousts them. I do not mean to say some are not opium eaters, but the general decay of the Mahommedans is due to their falling behind the Hindus in the race for life. Another point I wish to mention is that it has been said that dispensaries can supply opium to all Bengal. From the last report on charitable dispensaries in Bengal, it appears that, in the year 1892, there were only 282 charitable dispensaries, and out of these seventy-two were private, with which Government had no connection. I fancy that these would not be engaged in selling opium; this would leave 205 dispensaries for all Bengal. Another point which has been raised in Mr. Evans' evidence is that the ryots object to cultivation. I can only say that no pressure is put upon any ryot to cultivate, and that yearly, I may almost say daily, I receive petitions from ryots against Sub-Opium agents for refusing to give them licenses. Instead of getting petitions objecting to cultivating, the petitions are almost entirely from ryots who complain of their not being allowed to cultivate.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—You remarked that was used to keep off fever, and that it was the only excised article used for that purpose by Mahommedans. I suppose they have no difficulty in using articles that are not excised?

A.—That is why I put in the word "excised." Quinine might also be used, but there is very strong prejudice amongst natives against its use, because they think it gives them a headache.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—You say in the first page that opium is largely used in the Bakergunge, Dacca, Faridpore, and other districts, and Orissa: are these malarious lands?

A.—Some of the most malarious lands.

Q.—Yet the price in Orissa is Rs. twenty-two per seer.

A.—The price is fixed with reference to the facilities with which smuggling can be carried on. Orissa is most remote from the opium-producing districts, and it is most difficult to take it there. The price, therefore, is higher than in Bengal. I may add that we have had a strong representation from the Assam Government to raise the price at Rungpore and other districts, and the Government of Bengal has so far been unable to accede to the wishes of the Assam Government, simply upon the ground that the facilities for smuggling are so great that raising the price would lead to smuggling.

Q.—Is it not an anomaly that the price in Orissa, which you say is a most malarious district, is exceedingly high ?

A.—Exceedingly high, in one sense of the word. If you buy one dose, the price is very little, and you must remember that the doses taken are perfectly infinitesimal. The ordinary amount which is taken is so small, that it would be laughed at in England. If you look at the statistics, you will see that in the whole of Bengal the expense, per head, is only ·038 of a rupee.

Q.—The fact remains that it is just twice as high in Orissa as in Patna ?

A.—Just so ; we are obliged to keep it down at Patna, because there it is grown and if the price were high, there would be smuggling.

Q.—Doubling the price makes a difference to the Government, but it makes no difference to the people ?

A.—Not very great, as the people can still get enough for the purposes they require.

Q.—You say that the opponents of the present system would find themselves on the horns of a dilemma : I suppose you know they would say that if it is bad, it should be done away with ?

A.—As I said before, I think it would be too dangerous to give up this source of revenue. I do not think any Government of India would care to do away with the production of opium.

Q.—You also say that any measures of a prohibitory character would be viewed with disfavour by the people ; do you think the people view the restrictive legislation with disfavour ?

A.—Most distinctly so ; I believe that if they were polled, they would vote for universal production all over the country. We have no such thing in India as the poor of England. The poor in India, ordinarily, are poor men, but not poor men in the sense

of the English poor. They have not much, but the country is one in which they can live in comparative comfort. So that the state of the very poor is different from that of the poor in England. We have not that class of the poor to deal with that we have in England.

Q.—You refer to the *Opium Manual?*

A.—Yes, it consists of three bulky volumes.

Q.—If fever is prevalent in a district, Government sends medicine into it?

A.—Yes, I think so.

Q.—Do they also send opium.

A.—Government does send out medicines, but what I do not know.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—You have a system of druggists' permits; please explain what the system is?

A.—They are allowed to have a small quantity of opium, so much as they may reasonably use in their legitimate business, but not to sell for any but medical purposes.

Q.—Do they get these licenses at a cheaper rate?

A.—They are of a form altogether different from the vendors' licenses, and they have no right to vend opium alone.

Q.—And therefore they pay less?

A.—Yes, the whole of these satistics will be put before you by the Excise Commissioner.

Q.—Have you any reason to suppose that the system is abused?

A.—Not at present; we are restricting it to some extent, but I don't think it is abused.

Q.—I suppose these druggists don't profess to supply all the opium required for medieal purposes?

A.—Nothing like that, they don't supply a hundredth part.

Q.—If you extend the system, there would be some risk of abuse?

A.—If you extend the system, every *kobiraj*, *hakim*, and *baid*, in every village would require licenses.

Q.—In regard to retail prices, can you give us any details?

A.—No, it depends very much upon the license fee.

Q.—The result of the difference between the Government price in Patna and Orissa is that the increased profits go to the person who happens to reside near the manufactory?

A.—No; it is sold very cheap in Patna, where the license fee is almost nothing, so that the opium is sold at almost the same rate as the

Government retails it. You see that only Rs. 538 was obtained in Patna for license fees .

Q.—Practically you find yourself compelled to sell it very cheap in the districts where it is grown?

A.—Yes, we are compelled to do so.

By Mr. Haridas.—Q.—The crop is a very paying one?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The ryots get an advance and get a double profit upon it.

A.—They get the advantage of advances, and during favourable years the crop is very paying. But during the last three or four years the crop has been a bad one; but even in bad years it pays better than the ordinary crops. Opium is essentially a garden crop, grown close to the men's houses.

Q.—Is it not an injustice to the ryots who grow other crops not to get advances?

A.—Any man can get an advance who undertakes to cultivate this crop. Advances are made for no other crops.

Q.—Is it not an injustice to other cultivators?

A.—If you will call it so.

Q.—If poppy is the only crop for which advances are made, it is the only crop on which you fix a price?

A.—Yes, the only one.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—Does the poppy crop occupy the whole ground?

A.—I know no case in which it occupies the whole ground ; only an infinitesimal part.

By Sir James Lyall.—Q.—The price to the consumer in Chittagong has been raised to fifty Rs. or seventy Rs.?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Will you explain how the price was raised?

A.—I was Commissioner at the time, and received a strong representation from the Burma Government as to the smuggling of opium from Chittagong into Burma, 114 maunds of opium being consumed in one year in the Cox's Bazaar sub-division, while the real consumption could not have been over twelve maunds. The only way to stop it was to raise the license fee, and we made them pay license fees in proportion to the number of seers they took, which raised the price enormously, fixing an almost exceptional rate.

Q.—In the districts where the Government price is low is the farming system used?

A.—Yes, the result of this is to raise the price to the consumer.

Q.—The object of raising the price to the consumer by the two ways mentioned is I understand, to prevent the opium vendor from smuggling?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you come across any instances of Government officials being discharged or degraded for the alcoholic habit?

A.—More than once ; a good many. When I was Inspector-General of Police, I had to deal with more than one case.

Q.—Have you also known of any instances of discharge from the opium habit?

A.—Never, not even a Native.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Do you see any disadvantage in closing *chundoo* shops?

A.—Not further than interfering with the liberties of the subject. In Calcutta I don't think it can be done, because there are so many Chinese here; but in the Mofussil, I don't think it would be a very great hardship. It is the most harmful method of taking opium.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—A number of persons are refused permission to cultivate from time to time?

A.—Yes, because opium is a garden crop.

Q.—Also because the Government don't require so much of it?

A.—Yes.

By the Maharajah of Dharbhunga.—Q.—Is the poppy cultivated simply for the sake of the opium manufacture, or is any other use made of it?

A.—The ryot, in addition to what he receives from the Government, sells the poppy seed at a high rate. This yields about thirty-six seers per acre, and besides this, the stalks are used as manure. There is one thing I should like to add. I only saw this morning a publication, which has put forward the very strong indictment against the use of the poppy, that no less than 77,378 seers are used in Bengal in the year. I must say these figures look very big; but reduce them to totals and deal with them in reference to the population, and you will find that the yearly consumption of the adult male population of Bengal amounts to seven-tenths of a rupee in weight in the year. This is the weight every adult consumes, and I do not think that it is very much.

Evidence of Mr. Hoskins, examined by Sir James Lyall.

By the Chairman.—Q.—I believe you are a civilian of 32 years' standing, and are now Opium Agent at Patna, and have been so for the past six months ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I don't propose to take you through the whole or question you in detail as to the Agency System, but are there any points on which you specially desire to offer any observation ?

A.—There is only one point of difference in the Patna Agency as compared with the Benares Agency, and that is that I pay commission to Jamadars, and that the *assammari* system is not so much in force in Patna as in the Benares Agency. It is a system by which advances are made frequently to cultivators.

Q.—From what you have seen in your long experience, do you think that the people who take opium habitually, generally end by taking it in excess ?

A.—I have never come across a case of excess in opium during the whole of my career.

Q.—Have you known cases in which officials have been dismissed or disgraced in consequence of the alcoholic habit ?

A.—I cannot say I have, I don't recollect any.

Q.—From the opium habit ?

A.—No.

Q.—Is there in your opinion, any cause for prohibiting the use of opium in these provinces except for medicinal purposes ?

A.—No, certainly not.

Q.—Can medical use be distinguished from non-medical use ?

A.—No, opium is used medicinally, at first, for insomnia, irritation of the nerves and malaria, I believe.

Q.—Do you think any system for the use of opium medicinally only, could be properly worked ?

A.—I don't think it could. I do not see how any such provision could be made because the consumption of opium amongst people of over fifty is very considerable.

Q.—What do the Natives of these provinces think of prohibition ?

A.—I do not think that thay think about it at all ; they have heard of it but they can give no opinion on the subject ; they cannot understand it. They all, I may add, say that opium is of such general use

that it would be impossible to prohibit its consumption, and that it would be a great hardship to do so.

Q.—Would the people in your part be willing to bear a part of the cost of prohibition ?

A.—Certainly not.

Q.—Is there any part of your Excise System which ought to be altered on moral grounds.

A.—I do not consider the opium shops can be altered, and the opium licensee very generally sells as a *moodi*. The opium vendor in the agricultural tracts generally sells as a *moodi*, but that is not the case in town.

Q.—What do you say is generally the size of the circle in which there is an opium shop ?

A.–I should think about fifty square miles.

Q.—Do the same classes generally use both opium and alcohol ?

A.—No.

Q.—If they use the one, they do not use the other ?

A.—No, alcohol is used by the lowest classes, opium by the upper classes. Alcohol most considerably by those of the writer class if belonging to the better class.

Q.—If the use of opium was checked would some other stimulant take its place ?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—Can you give us any information of the magnitude of the interests bound up in opium in your district ?

A.—For these I refer you to the statement appended to my note. The number of licenses collected in 1882-93 was 637,157 and the sum disbursed over eighty lacs. It is impossible to say how the withdrawal of this amount would affect the country, but it would mean a very considerable reduction in rents. Eighty lacs represents to the poor ryots of this country what £4,000,000 would represent to the British labourer and small cultivator.

Q.—By Mr. Pease :—You state in your note that you have met with no case of the use of opium for non-medical purposes.

A.—I meant to say that it commences with the medical use, and is continued.

Q.—Do you mean to say that apart from opium altogether, poppy cultivation would pay if there were only the seed ?

A.—Yes. The poppy seed is used for the manufacture of oil and is largely used for cooking purposes in India.

Q.—Poppy cultivation would pay if there was no opium grown.

A.—Yes, every seer of opium produces some two maunds of poppy-seed, and twelve seers of this seed can be sold for Rs. 37/8.

Q.—So that the money the cultivators would get for opium would be clear gain and profit?

A.—Yes, though sometimes there is only two seers of Poppy to the bigha, and then it would not.

Q.—If a cultivator is refused a license to grow, does he pay less rent?

A.—It would very much depend upon the crop.

Q.—The Zemindar would reduce the rent if any other crop was grown?

A.—Most probably, but I cannot say for certain.

Q.—We were told by Mr. Rivett Carnac yesterday that the Zemindar has no interest to put pressure upon the ryots?

A.—That may be in the N.-W. Provinces but in Behar there is the Permanent Settlement.

Q.—Can a Zemindar raise or lower rents according to whether a particular cultivator gets permission to grow upon his land?

A.—If the *assammari* ryot sowed poppy upon land the rent would be raised usually a third, if it was not grown I imagine it would be reduced. Poppy lands require four or five years' cultivation to come into thorough bearing.

Q.—Do you receive from year to year official intimation as to the amount of land which should be devoted to opium?

A.—The quantity of opium to be produced. We are forbidden to exceed the average of the area of the previous five years. I think within the last three or four years there has been a reduction of ten per cent all round.

Q.—Was there enhancement of rents or not?

A.—For poppy cultivation? I do not know.

Q.—By the Maharaja of Durbhanga:—There is a special rate on poppy lands?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it not the customary rule to rent lands according to its quality and not according to the crop?

A.—It is so.

Q.—Therefore, if the tenant chooses to grow poppy, the landlord cannot ask for enhanced rent?

A.—That is a point of law ; I cannot say. Poppy land is already charged high, and poppy and tobacco lands are about the same.

Q.—If the cultivation of the poppy is stopped, the ryots could ask for a reduction?

A.—I suppose it depends upon the crop itself.

There is one point in connection with the opium monopoly which has probably escaped notice, that, it enables cultivators to improve their holdings, in spite of the Zemindar, who, as a rule, opposes all improvement for fear the ryots should be entitled to compensation.

Q.—By Mr. Fanshawe :—Explain what you mean.

A.—Improvements are registered under the Bengal Tenancy Act, and if a ryot, who makes these, is ejected, he is entitled to compensation. For instance, we get him to make a well ; the money is advanced without interest, the ryot makes the well. This constitutes an improvement, and if he is ejected, he is entitled to compensation.

Q.—By Mr. Pease :—During what period are these advances repaid ?

A.—I am not aware.

Evidence of Doctor Maynard, medical officer in charge of the Patna Opium Agency.

Q.—By Sir William Roberts :—Before you assumed charge of your present office, what services had you in India?

A.—I was in the Punjab, the N.-W. P., Behar ; with Native troops of all ranks, over 5000, and of all classes. They were Sikhs, Rajpoots, Dogras, Hindustanis and various Punjabis.

Q.—In this opium factory, how many are employed ?

A.—The maximum number employed was 2,758 and the minimum number 606.

Q.—Altogether you have had experience of different kinds?

A.—Between these two services, I was in civil employ, as civil Surgeon of Burdwan and Nuddea. These are particularly malarial districts, so much so, that, in Nuddea, the population between the two last censuses had decreased over 30 per cent from malaria.

Q.—Have you had any opportunities of judging how for the opium habit prevails ?

A.—I think it is always difficult to form an opinion as to how many men take opium, unless some effects are apparent. I know that troops

have the reputation of being opium-eaters; but I know that they don't exhibit any ill effects from it.

Q.—Is opium served out to them?

A.—On active service, it is; in cantonments it is not served out.

Q.—In these regiments did you observe any ill effects from opium?

A.—I can only remember one man, a Sikh, who was an opium-eater, to a rather larger extent than usual. He took about thirty grains daily, and mostly he was stupid, so much so, that it was decided to pension him.

Q.—Can you say, from the looks of the men who took it, that there was anything like disease?

A.—No; I have been surprised to find men pointed out as opium-eaters, but I could not say they were so.

Q.—Did you see anything in the shape of disease?

A.—No, certainly not.

Q.—In reference to your other experiences of the effects of opium, did you observe a considerable consumption of opium amongst the people?

A.—No; certainly not. As far as the factory hands were concerned, I don't believe they consume opium. One sees them all day long, their duties are severe, and one would catch them trip, if they did consume it; but it is unknown in fact. I have made very searching enquiries from the officers of the factory, but I could not hear of any case of opium-eating amongst them.

Q.—There are malarial districts about Burdwan and Patna?

A.—There is a certain amount in Patna, but not so much as in Lower Bengal.

Q.—Children are subject to malaria?

A.—I think they are very subject, and the effects upon them are more disastrous. They have spleens enlarged with malarial cachexia. They may have been born of malarial mothers, but I have not seen any.

Q.—Do you think that quinine ought to displace opium for malaria?

A.—No; I do not think so, because, in such districts, other diseases, such as bowel complaints and diabetes, prevail, and then people take to opium.

Q.—Is it a popular domestic remedy?

A.—It is not possible to get medical prescriptions by a great part of the population, and they have to use it.

Q.—Is not medical advice within their reach?

A.—Oh, no ; the dispensary system cannot reach the great masses of the population in Nuddea. It has an area of 3304 square miles, with a population of two millions. I had an assistant surgeon and several hospital assistants, and there were five dispensaries scattered over the district, but, in spite of all that, there are large numbers who cannot avail themselves of these. In many villages there are *hakims*, but their knowledge is small.

Q.—Is the opium made at the factory, which is used as a domestic remedy?

A.—It is opium obtained from licensed vendors which is used, and that must have been manufactured at the factory.

Q.—You have paid some attention to the analysis of the various classes of opium, what are the differences between Persian, Indian and other opium.

A.—This note has been compiled from the laboratory records. [witness reads out and hands in the statement.]

Q.—You are aware that opium is an extremely complicated substance, can you tell us whether the effects produced by the Indian drug are the same here as those produced by our medicinal opium in England?

A.—The distinction is marked. Smyrna opium, the official drug in use in Europe, contains a much larger preparation of morphia and a smaller proportion of narcotine. People who use Indian Opium regularly, are consuming more narcotine. In India we supply two kinds of medical opium, one in cakes and one in powder.

Q.—Indians use opium much more freely than Europeans do at home?

A.—I believe so.

Q.—The variety of opium sent out for medical use is called Patna garden opium, and it is sent out for general use ?

A.—It is all garden opium ; there is no special test for medical opium—practically there is no difference.

Q.—There are no ill effects from the use of opium on the general health of the population?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you noticed any in their moral faculties ?

A.—I have not seen any.

Q.—By Mr. Pease:—What is the difference between medical and other opium ?

A.—Medical opium is opium of ninety per cent and ten per cent moisture, and the difference between it and ordinary abkari opium is in the degree of consistency arrived at.

Q.—What is the object of making any difference with process ?

A.—The result is different ; medical opium to the touch and sight is not the same as Abkari opium.

Q.—The analysis is the same ?

A.—Yes, it has the same effects too, I believe.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson.—Medical opium is not in cakes in the same way as the other ?

A.—It is the same opium dried at the steam tables until all the the moisture has evaporated.

Q.—The difference really is one as to moisture ; the chemical composition is the same?

A.—Yes, opium for China, seventy-five; medicinal, ninety; abkari, ninety.

Q.—By Mr. Mowbray.—Do you say that opium is actually served out to the troops upon service ?

A.—I believe it is, I know that opium is taken on expeditions, and it is taken as a ration in the supplies.

Q.—By Mr. Fanshawe:—What regiments have you served in ?

A.—The 2nd P. C., the 2nd B. C., (Sikhs) 4th Hazara mountain Battery, (all Sikhs) the Punjab Garrison Battery, the 1st Sikhs, a wing of the 4th, the 4th Sikhs, the 5th Sikhs, the 4th P. I. the 5th Shekwarti regiment, the 27th P. I. and also the 2-3rd Ghurkhas and a wing of the 2-5 Ghurkhas. Opium was served out to the Sikhs.

Q.—To what particular regiments was it served out as a ration ?

A.—The 4th Sikhs and 2-5 Ghukhas I refer to.

Q,—By Mr. Wilson.—Do I understand that the Sikhs were supplied with opium as a ration ?

A.—I was not connected with the issue of rations.

Q.—There was a limit to the quantity ?

A.—Oh yes, there was a limit, but I do not remember the quantity

---

Printed by

Joseph Culshaw, for the Methodist Publishing House, Calcutta.

Pam Drugs
Opium

777

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part VI. 25th November, 1893.

PRICE ONE PENNY, or ONE ANNA, for each part.

Published by the
SOCIETY FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE OPIUM TRADE,
BROADWAY CHAMBERS, LONDON, S. W.
Also at the
METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, 45, DHARAMTALA ST., CALCUTTA.

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Surgeon-Colonel Robert Harvey's Evidence.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—Please state your position in the Medical Service.

A.—I am at present Inspector-General of Civil Hospitals in Bengal. I am, and have been, in the service for nearly twenty-nine years.

Q.—Kindly tell us what service you have had.

A.—I was for more than five years in Rajputana where opium is very largely used by the people. I have been four years in Malwa, where it is extensively cultivated ; I was for five years in the Punjab where it is also largely taken by the Sikhs; and twelve years in a large practice in Calcutta. I have been six times on frontier expeditions, some of them involving great hardships. I have had considerable experience of jail management, and during all my service have had large experience of opium-eaters. I also visited China when I was on furlough.

Q.—When was your attention first drawn to the opium question ?

A.—My attention was first drawn to the opium question in Lancashire during the time of the cotton famine, and the American war, when I was assistant to the House Surgeon of Stockport Infirmary. Applications used to be frequently made to the infirmary for a supply of opium by people who were then too poor to buy it ; the applications were invariably rejected, and the parties were warned against the danger of using opium. I was much struck with the fact that opium was so commonly used, and habitual smokers of ten or fifteen grains of opium a day seemed to be no worse for it. I would not have believed that such was the case.

Q.—Do you connect with that the partial famine in Lancashire ?

A.—They were people who were in the habit of taking opium, and only came to the hospital for it, because they could not buy it for themselves. It had no connection with the famine.

Q.—In what form would they take the opium ?

A.—They took it generally in the shape of pills, and sometimes in a liquid shape.

Q.—What has been your experience in Rajputana and Malwa ?

A.—In India my experience has been very much the same. During the famine of 1868-69 numbers of half-starved people, most of them refugees from other States, were treated in the hospital at Bhurtpore, and they appeared to have suffered comparatively little. A large number of them were accustomed to take opium in small pills, never exceeding two or three grains, without apparently any effect save to their comfort and enjoyment. In all ordinary cases we had no idea that the patient was an opium-eater until he asked for opium. I know of no criterion by which a moderate opium-eater can be recognised. Many of them acknowledged that they had acquired the habit, and many of them, especially those who were sepoys, and knew that the British officers were apt to look with suspicion on them, would deny the fact, and only confess it under pressure from medical officers. I have known repeated instances of this.

Q.—You are now speaking of opium taken in moderation. Were they inclined to increase the dose ?

A.—In my experience they were not. Many do increase it, but in the average man there is no necessity to increase the dose, and I don't think they do increase it. I have seen opium taken in excess, by what I call an opium drunkard, which, perhaps, is a misnomer, because in this country opium is more eaten than drunk.

Q.—What evil results have you observed in the opium drunkard ?

A.—The regular opium drunkard is a most pitiable object ; he is a lean, emaciated, dried-up, and altogether broken-down, and good-for-nothing wretch ; but I have seen, comparatively speaking, very few of them. I don't think any organic disease is produced by excess in opium eating ; but a large number of these who thus suffer take to opium-eating.

Q.—Do you think that some of them are diseased ?

A.—Yes, the great majority of them, but I think that in a great majority of cases, the cause of the taking of opium in excess is that they have suffered from some painful or wasting disease which calls for the ease which opium-eating gives. No doubt some take it for sensual enjoyment.

Q.—Do you mean by that, enjoyment similar to what many people experience in taking morphia ?

A.—Except that the feeling which opium produces is probably more marked. Certainly the feeling which opium gives is much more marked than that given by morphia.

Q.—Then, may I take it from you that even opium drunkenness, pure and simple, does not, so far as you know, develop aay organic disease ?

A.—I have never seen a case that I should distinctly put down to the effects of opium.

Q.—In your experience, the vast majority of Indian opium-eaters take it moderately ?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—What would you call the average dose of a moderate opium-eater ?

A.—I cannot give a numerical unit. A pice worth will last some persons one or two or three days : others take two pice worth a day. In my experience many took a pice worth daily and a good many two pice worth. Again, a very much larger number make it last two, three, or four days. A pice worth means four grains. Two grains are a very fair daily allowance, but a good many take four and eight grains. When you go beyond that, you are getting to exeess.

Q.—What effect has opium on moderate eaters ?

A.—It supports and comforts them, especially when under exertion or exposure. It enables them to do a great deal on what seems to Europeans an insufficient diet. And I believe it acts as a prophylactic, especially against diarrhoea, rheumatism, malarial fever, dysentery and I think I might add, diabetes.

Q.—What, in yonr experience, was the effect of opium upon Sikhs and Rajputs ?

A.—As a race, the Sikhs and Rajputs are two of the finest races in India, and anybody knowing India would say so ; they are a very martial race, and a very considerable proportion of them take to the opium habit. I cannot give you any numerical proportion, because I have not studied the subject.

Q.—I understand that opium is served out to the native troops on the march ?

A.—I have never heard of opium being actually served out, but I think the commissariat takes a supply to sell to the sepoys on the march, in order that there might be no difficulty about the sepoys getting opium when they want it.

Q.—Have you any experience of China ?

A.—I visited it in 1874, and was there for about three weeks. It struck me that the physique of the common people was very good, and I was much struck by two Chinamen who carried me about in Hongkong, and who both said they smoked opium. I have never seen finer men ; they carried me up the steep streets of Hongkong with perfect ease.

Q.—What is your experience of opium-eaters, who are men of business in Calcutta ?

A.—There is a large class of some of the greatest business men in Calcutta who are opium-eaters, bold speculators who can hold their own with anybody. These are the Marwaries who are supposed to come from Marwar, in Rajputana, and I know from long practice among them that many of them take opium. I think that few men, who have once made it a practice to take opium, ever give it up, as few men who smoke or drink in moderation in other countries, give up their drink or tobacco ; bút they could, if they wished, give it up without any difficulty or danger. I have never known a Native come to the hospital to be cured of the opium habit. I have never known them give up under advice. I am speaking mainly of cases of disease where I have advised them to give it up. For many years I don't remember ever having interfered with a patient's opium habit. I treated cases absolutely without reference to that habit. It did not interfere with my treatment in any way, I think that in the case of the opium drunkard, there is great difficulty in giving it up ; he finds it extremely difficulty to do so. But it is not the opium which he cannot conquer, but the initial weakness of will which led to the original excess. He has so little power of self-control that he cannot nerve himself to undergo the amount of discomfort attendant upon the relinquishment of a habit.

Q.—In Indian jails, opium is not allowed ?

A.—The rule is that all opium found on a prisoner on admission is to be confiscated, and he is not allowed to get any, and smuggling opium into jail is punishable as a jail offence ; and I believe that, as a rule, the supply of opium is cut off at once and entirely. People say that the men get it by smuggling. I should be sorry to say that they never do, but I think they must be exceptions. I think our jail discipline is sufficiently good to make it difficult for every opium eater to easily supply himself. No doubt it can be done casually. I have known and heard of considerable temporary suffering caused by the stoppage of opium, but it has never led to any dangerous results, and the suffering passes off in a few days ; but in extreme cases they suffer for a long time. Even then they get free in time. I have known a considerable number of bad cases

among Europeans and Eurasians, but in only one case did it lead to death, and even in that case it would be hard to say that opium was the cause. In that case the man was overworked and had insufficient food, and was often drenched to the skin every night by heavy dews. Opium might have been a factor in the case, but it was not the only factor.

Q.—The evidence given before us almost unanimously suggests the fact that opium does not produce any known organic change but it has been stated by several witnesses that the habitual taking of opium makes a person more liable to disease. Is that your opinion ?

A.—I can understand that in the case of the opium drunkard, although it has not been my experience ; but with moderate opium-eaters, I believe the exact contrary to be the truth. In the first Maranzri Expedition in 1891, we marched without trouble through constant rain, and sometimes 20 degrees of frost ; the men were very hard-worked ; there were excessive cold winds and storms, and the men were wet to the skin every day : 40 of them were frost-bitten, yet the death-rate was only 7·3 per cent, about half the death-rate of those who were doing nothing in cantonments.

Q.—What has been the effect of opium on the moral character ?

A.—As far as I know, the moderate use of opium has no effect on the moral character, and even excess does not lead to the commission of violent crimes. The opium drunkard only seeks to be let alone. If poor, he may be led to petty thefts to supply himself with opium, and in many instances patients who do not wish to give up the habit bring opium with them, and lie unblushingly about it. It is the same thing in the case of alcohol : they swear that they have not touched a drop of liquor when probably they reek of alcohol. I think that in both these cases, there is a want of moral control ; it is not the alcohol or the opium ; it is the want of self-control in the patient. The worst result I saw was in the case of a fine young woman who deliberately prostituted herself during the Lancashire cotton famine, in order to get money to buy opium.

Q.—What do you think generally of the value of dietetic opium among stimulants ?

A.—I think it one of the most harmless, useful and necessary blessings that man can have. I think it is God's best gift, as opium was characterised by Dr. George.

Q.—Is there anything else you would like to mention ?

Utter blasphemy

A.—I believe, although I have no evidence to offer on the point, that if a man accustomed to opium were to be effectively denied it,—of the possibility of which I have great doubts, because it is so easily smuggled,—he will take to other stimulants, and if he takes to *ganja* or alcohol, the last stage of that man will be very much worse than the first. Two grains being taken as the amount taken in one day, a year's supply would fit into a box $2'' \times 1\frac{1}{2}'' \times \frac{3}{4}''$; it would take two years' supply for a man who takes one grain a day, and half a year's supply for a man taking a pice worth daily ; and any native could so easily conceal it in his loin cloth or his *pugree* that you would have to strip him naked before you could find it. It would be almost impossible that you could support a policy of this sort of espionage, and I don't believe that the people would stand it.

Q.—Do you, in the course of your duties, mix very largely with medical men in the Indian service ?

A.—Not only in the Indian service, but in the medical staff, and with a large number of native medical practitioners, University graduates of sorts.

Q.—Are the views you express held very generally by the profession in India ?

A.—By all but an infinitesimal minority ; we medical men who have practical experience in India are practically at one.

Q.—I suppose you know the suggested reason why natives of India should take to the use of opium, and tolerate it ?

A.—I think it a race question. Practically, looking all round the world, we find that each nation has its own habits. All mankind want stimulants of some kind. The Northern nations of Europe take to a spirit stimulant. In the south of Europe spirits are much less used, and wine is generally taken as a stimulant ; and northern nations are able to take a quantity of spirits which in the tropics kills them off. Spirits are absolutely unsuited to the tropics. Opium is the best stimulant and the people of this country have found it to be a necessity. In the north, spirits, like everything else, are liable to abuse, but as moderate men and the great majority take it, it not only does no harm, but it is taken with considerable comfort.

There is also one practical point which has been brought up in evidence by several preceding witnesses : Everybody admits that opium must be allowed for medical purposes ; with that reservation, it has been felt possible by some to prohibit the use of opium. The last report of

just exactly the position we do not take.

medical institutions points out as a matter of fact that, in a population of over seventy millions, only $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. get any benefit from the Government medical institutions. There are no doubt a certain number of private hospitals, but the great bulk of the people have no medical advice, unless they go to *baids* and *hakims* who have no real qualifications, are not registered, and must be allowed to give certificates for the supply of opium, and there is nothing to prevent any man from setting up for his own *baid* or *hakim* and from what I know of the native character anybody who could give four annas could easily get a certificate. In this way, you will not decrease the consumption of opium, but will simply embarrass the Government.

By the President.—Q.—Have you any particular experience of the use of opium ?

A.—I have myself been an opium-eater in a very strange way, but I trust I shall not be considered to be one now. My first experience was during a professional examination I had to undergo when suffering from a severe attack of influenza cold. Thirty drops of laudanum taken to induce sleep acted as a charm. It removed the stupidity induced by the cold, cleared my brain, and enabled me to go through the examination. Before taking the laudanum my brain was so clouded that I could not bring to mind what I had learned, but the effect of the dose was to bring the whole of my books clearly before me. Again, in 1871-72 when, in charge of the advance hospital in the Lushai expedition, I had nearly 2,000 sick and wounded passing through my hands in less than three months. Sometimes there were 400 at a time in hospital, and I had during most of the time only one hospital assistant and no nurse, orderlies or clerks to help me. I began the campaign with a severe attack of fever which kept recurring every few days, and I believe I should have broken down, but for having resorted to opium. I may have taken opium thirty or forty times. I never exceeded a grain of it, never hankered for more, and had no difficulty in stopping it. It sustained and comforted me. I have taken it some ten times since, always under circumstances of great fatigue and exposure, and always with the same result.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—When suffering from great exertions and resorting to the aid of opium, you resorted to it as a stimulant, and not for any other purpose ?

A.—As a stimulant. It also arrested waste of tissue and enabled me to do more than I could otherwise have done.

Q.—Would not there be a corresponding degree of depression afterwards ?

A.—I don't think opium has that effect unless taken in large quantities. I found no reaction or depression whatever.

Q.—Do you find that persons in the habit of taking opium are equally susceptible to the effects of other drugs ?

A.—I think so.

Q.—You spoke of opium-eaters as being under the influence of a weak will. Would not the effect of the opium be to weaken the power of the will ?

A.—I could not give any definite opinion.

Q.—You made a quotation from Dr. Gregory. Was he not at that time alluding to opium as a medicine, and not when taken as an indulgence ?

A.—No doubt. But in many cases the habit has begun for the relief of pain, and people find it so comforting that they go on with it.

Q.—Are you in favour of reducing the facilities for obtaining opium ?

A.—I don't think that at all necessary.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—You refer in the second paragraph of your printed statement to a person in Lancashire who would take four ounces of laudanum daily. Was that the case of the young woman of whom you spoke ?

A.—Yes ; she came to ask for opium because she had no means of getting it.

Q.—Four ounces of laudanum would cost a considerable sum ?

A.—Yes, but her husband was a well-to-do operative, and she had been able to get it up to the time of the cotton famine ; they were all turned out of the works, and she came to us for opium, but we refused to give it.

Q.—You referred to the Miranzai expedition, and said that many of the sepoys used opium. You cannot give the proportion ?

A.—I have never made a numerical calculation, but it was well known that the Sikh sepoys took opium, although many of them would deny it. I ascertained that of the forty men who were frost-bitten none were opium eaters.

Q.—Opium-eaaters and non-opium-eaters alike stood the hardship of the campaign ?

A.—Yes ; I don't suggest that the non-opium-eaters died faster. The real cause of the diminished death-rate is to be found in the admirable arrangements made by the Government for the comfort, feeding, and shelter of the troops.

Q.—I don't remember whether you read this passage in your statement : " I believe it sharpens the mental faculties, brightens the wits, and improves the physical powers." Then why don't you take it yourself?

A.—I believe so. I don't take it because I don't find it necessary. I think my wits are bright enough. Seriously, I think it does have that effect, especially under the circumstances under which I have taken it, and should always take it.

Q.—I wish to know whether you regard it as valuable mainly under peculiar circumstances of distress, or whether you mean to say that it has those effects upon habitual opium-eaters throughout life?

A.—I am not in a position to answer that, but I know that it kept my head clear when I thought I might fail in my examination. It cleared my brains in a most wonderful way.

Q.—I think I may take it that, as a matter of fact, you do not recommend it as a practice to persons who wish to have sharp brains?

A.—I would not recommend it.

Q.—Have you recommended anybody to take it regularly?

A.—No, certainly not for that purpose.

Q.—Then in reference to your own experience, when you were suffering from that severe influenza cold, you were taking it as a medicine?

A.—Yes, in that case. That showed me the value of it. That was before I had any experience in other places. When I was a student I took it temporarily for a medical purpose. Afterwards I took it as a stimulant.

Q.—Speaking generally, I want to know whether the evidence you have been giving is limited especially to eating, drinking, or smoking?

A.—I have practically no experience of smoking, except in the case of the two men at Hongkong to whom I have alluded. The great majority of the people of this country take opium as a pill. In Rajputana especially, in a few cases, it is made into a solution and drunk. A certain number of people in the large cities of India, especially where there are Chinese, learn the habit of smoking, but I have no experience to speak of. My experience is of eating or drinking.

Q.—You were five years in Rajputana. We have had some difficulty in ascertaining what proportion of the people who are called Rajputs are really Rajputs ?

A.—You may practically take the whole population. They are not all pure Rajputs. There are numerous mixed races among them, but as far as my knowledge goes, all of them take opium much in the same proportion. I could not reduce it to a numerical figure.

Q.—In consequence of some difficulty which was felt I referred to *Hunter's Gazetteer*, and he gives the population of Rajputana at ten million odd, and the number of the Rajput class as half a million or 5·5 per cent. of the whole population ?

A.—My remark refers to the whole population.

Q.—Do you know the view of the American missionary, Dr. Huntly, who has lived for years in Rajputana ?

A.—I don't.

Q.—Amongst other things he says natives of Rajputana have a practice of drinking milk with opium, perhaps to ward off some of its effects. On the other hand, those who take opium can be detected at a glance. Is that your experience?

A.—I believe there are indications when opium is taken in excess but there is not the least indication where opium is moderately used. The average moderate opium-eater is absolutely unrecognisable.

Q.—Then further on Dr. Huntly says: "During seven years of constant intercourse with them, I have never met a native who considered the drug harmless." That is not your opinion ?

A.—Certainly not.

Q.—He goes on to say that on a careful inquiry of one hundred cases he found nearly forty per cent. practiced the habit to stimulate the sexual appetite?

A.—I believe that a certain number of men do take it as an aphrodisiac under a deluded idea of its effect. I don't believe it has that property. Whenever any new aphrodisiac is started, every chemist will tell you that there is a tremendous rush upon it. Natives probably do practice the habit for that purpose ; I have not made any particular enquiry.

Q.—Do you know a work by Dr. Russell on malaria and the enlargement of the spleen? Is it not a work of considerable authority on the point?

A.—I have glanced through the book. It was many years ago. I don't think it has had any large circulation, but I have no doubt from what I know of Dr. Russell that the work ought to be valuable.

Q.—You have used the expression that it is very much a race question. Can you apply such a term to India?

A.—Perhaps "climatic question" would have been better. The races in India are very numerous. It is clear from the illustration I gave that I meant climatic question.

By Mr. Haridas Veharidas.—Q.—Do you ever take alcohol?

A.—I take alcohol, but in strict moderation.

Q.—You say you have taken opium forty or fifty times. Why did not you take alcohol?

A.—I did not take alcohol, because I could not get it. I should have taken if I could have got it.

Q.—Have you given up taking opium?

A.—Yes, afterwards I gave it up.

Q.—Since giving up taking opium, have you taken more alcohol than usual?

A.—No, no more than usual.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Did I understand you to say that in your experience opium was largely used as an aphrodisiac?

A.—I have no experience. There is nothing in opium which can have that effect.

Q.—Do you know the dose people take as an aphrodisiac?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Can you give any intimation as to the age, speaking generally, at which the classes of Rajputs and Sikhs begin to take opium?

A.—In Rajputana it is generally begun with children; sometimes it is continued in boyhood, but sometimes it is given up; sometimes mothers give it to their infants to keep them quiet, while they themselves are at work. I have seen children of three or four years take opium in Rajputana and the Punjab, but they give it up at intervals.

Q.—You said that there were some of the finest races of men in Rajputana. In using that expression you are referring to the Rajput proper?

A.—I am referring to the whole population of Rajputana. There are a number of fine men among races which are not related to the Raj-

puts—the *Jats* and *Dobras* for instance; and there are people of very mixed blood who are as fine and plucky men as you could wish to see.

Q.—Then the opium habit is equally common among Rajputs proper, and other classes of men in Rajputana?

A.—I think so.

Evidence of Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel A. Crombie, M.D.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—Will you state your position?

A.—I am Superintendent of the Presidency General Hospital, and have had a long Indian service and practice in my profession.

Q.—What means have you had of becoming acquainted with the opium habit in India?

A.—I have been a hospital physician and surgeon for nearly the whole of my service in India. I have served in the Medical College in Calcutta, and also in Rangoon and Dacca. I was for a long time Civil Surgeon of Dacca, but for only seven years of that period did I actually reside in Dacca. Besides hospital experience I have also been medical officer of two large jails, and have repeatedly had medical charge of one of those jails, and I have also had charge of a Lunatic Asylum in Dacca, where there were 220 lunatics, for seven years, and have also had considerable experience of the large province of Bengal generally, and have been often consulted by the Government of Bengal.

Q.—I understand you have paid much special attention to the opium question. Will you give us your experience of the consumption of opium in Bengal?

A.—I have made a number of calculations with regard to the consumption of opium in India and especially in Bengal. At page ninety-nine of the collection of papers on the consumption of opium in India published on the 9th January, 1892, the consumption is stated to be sufficient to furnish a daily dole of a quarter of an ounce to about 4,00,000 people; that comes to twenty-two and a half grains per 1,000 of the population of Bengal, or eight grains per head of the population for the whole of India, men, women, and children, and the cost of this would be four pice per annum. The cost of drinks consumed in England is £3 15s. per head of the population per annum. With regard to the proportion of opium to each opium-eater, no estimate can be made, but, taking a low estimate, it would give about 400 grains per annum to each opium-eater, or a little more than a grain a day. That would make opium-eaters about twenty per cent of the adult male population. In the Lower Provinces of Bengal, 1,942 maunds of opium are supplied for con-

sumption. That makes fifteen and a half grains per head of the population, or according to the same calculation, 300 grains per annum for each consumer, or a little below the daily average for each opium-eater. The amounts varies in different parts of Lower Bengal. A gentleman, Baboo Bejoy Madhub Mukerjee, Sub-Divisional Officer of Soopore, in Bhagulpore, furnished me the other day with some information. He stated that the quantity obtained from the treasury there was three maunds for a population of 600,000, which amounts to twelve and a half grains per annum per head of the population, or fifty grains to each consumer per annum. He mentioned in explanation of the little opium used there that a large quantity of alcohol was consumed by the population, and he considered that the two intoxicants were used in inverse proportion. In the Subdivision of Ranaghat, which is close to Calcutta, where alcohol is used in small quantities, twenty-five to thirty grains per head of the population, or about 600 grains per annum is used by each consumer, which is nearly two grains a day. With regard to this there are two or three explanations. The amount is very much smaller than is actually taken by the average consumer and it may be that only a portion of the consumers use it daily, leaving a considerably larger quantity for the others, or there may be a considerable quantity of illicit opium in constant use. My evidence with regard to the evil effects of opium upon the consumer in India, with every opportunity of observing its full effects, is almost absolutely in the negative.

Q.—But you have recognised that cases of the excessive use of opium occur?

A.—Yes, I have frequently met with natives who take opium in excess. I have not often noticed that an excessive quantity produced any deleterious effect. In one or two or perhaps three instances I have seen its deleterious effects in the course of my experience of twenty years, effects which I trace directly to opium unaccompanied by any pre-existing disease.

Q.—Does your memory carry you sufficiently far back to remember what was the condition of people who took opium to excess without any disease?

A.—It is rather difficult to find a case exactly fulfilling this condition. The first case brought prominently to my notice was that of a prisoner who was in the Rangoon Jail. He died in hospital from chronic diarrhœa. and the conclusion I came to, whether rightly or wrongly was that the death was due to excess of opium. Diarrhœa and dysentery are very common diseases in India. Death might have been

due to other causes, but the impression in my mind at the time was that death was due to opium. That was the only case which showed the evil effects of opium.

Q.—You have had considerable experience, having been in charge of hospitals and jails and lunatic asylums. Can you tell us whether the opium habit has been the cause of lunacy or the cause of crime?

A.—I have made a report on that point, which was published in a supplement to the *Indian Medical Gazette*, which I now formally present to the Commission. In that I have given my experience with regard to illness caused by the opium habit. The figures upon which my opinion was partly based will be found at page twenty-seven of that supplement. The statistics of the Bengal lunatic asylums are there given for ten years. The number of admissions during those ten years was 2,202; of that number 641 were *ganja* smokers or consumers of *ganja* in some form; 117 were drinkers of alcohol, and only eight were opium-eaters.

Q.—Those were alleged causes, so that a good many more of those may have been opium-eaters?

A.—In each case in which a patient was entered as taking *ganja* or opium or alcohol it was put down to that cause. With regard to *ganja* there is no question in my mind that *ganja* is the cause in a very large proportion of cases in which it is put down as the alleged cause. With regard to spirits, my experience is the same as the experience of asylums in England—twenty or twenty-five per cent. With regard to opium-eating I am of opinion that it is never the cause of insanity. What is put down in the paper meant that those eight patients were lunatics who were accustomed to take opium. I have also collected statistics for Bombay, Rangoon, and Madras, but they are not complete. I can only give the statistics for Bombay for three years, and for the Rangoon asylum for six years. In Bombay there are also very few opium-eaters detained as lunatics, while the number of spirit-drinkers has very considerably increased in the Colaba asylum, that is to say, a very considerably larger proportion of spirit-drinkers are admitted there than in any other lunatic asylum.

Q.—Will you give us the impression produced in your mind by studying this question?

A.—In the first place, opium-eating is essentially a habit acquired in the beginning of advanced life, while alcohol and *ganja* are intoxicants chiefly used below the age of thirty or thirty-five.

Q.—What do you consider the beginning of advanced life?

A.—Forty years, speaking of natives of India.

Q.—Do you think the people of India have a peculiar tolerance for opium?

A.—I have reason for believing that there is such tolerance, and I believe that a great deal of the agitation on the subject of opium is due to the difference in the effect of alcohol and especially morphia in European countries. The effect is much greater among people who use alcohol in India. It is also perfectly certain that all animals are not equally affected by opium. I have made a number of experiments with ducks and fowls. I have given the enormous quantity of thirty grains to a duck weighing $2\frac{1}{2}$ pounds, and in another of the same weight I have injected three grains of morphia. That would mean to a man of ten stone, 15 × 140 grains to a dose, or $1\frac{1}{2}$ grains of morphia to every pound weight of his body; $1\frac{1}{2}$ × 140 equals 210 grains for one injection. Beyond giving rise to a certain amount of nausea in all animals it seems to have no effect; during the first two days they are quite the same, inquisitive as ducks always are, and eat their food as usual. Fowls after two or three days eat very little, and are evidently affected by the dose. I made these experiments to satisfy myself that the statements made in the books are true, and I am now able to confirm them. Then as to the natives of India having some peculiarity in their constitution. With regard to bodily temperature I made some experiments in 1872-73-74 as to the normal temperature of the bodies of natives as well as of Europeans. I have drawn up the differences diagrammatically; the three last figures show the average temperature of men in England. The difference in temperature indicature indicates the difference in the tolerance of opium. The figures show that the average temperature of the population here is nearly half a degree higher than in England, and nearly a degree higher than that of Europeans living in Asia.

Q.—Have you any distinct evidence of the difference of tolerance of Europeans and natives?

A.—We can give larger doses here than in England. In acute diarrhœa I never give less than one drachm of landanum to a native; that is three times as much as I give in England. The laudanum procurable is mostly obtained from England and made from Turkey opium. I give a drachm dose freely without any hesitation to adults, but I think the difference of constitution is to be chiefly noticed in reference to children in England. The practice there is that opium should not be given at all to English children under five years of age, and only then under great precautions; but here in India we give it with hardly any precautions, even in children of a year old, in free doses. We give it also to English children. But I am now referring to native children.

* These experiments are valueless as poisons have very much different effects on different animals.

Q.—And do you observe any difference of doses in the two cases ?

A.—We give it more freely to native children than to English children. Native mothers constantly give opium to their babies a day or two old, and the practice is continued up to the age of about four years. Most of the ayahs or nurses when they find a peevish, fretful child give it the same dose as they are accustomed to give to their own children, and the children die. Such cases have fallen under my own experience. I have never treated a native child for opium poisoning during twenty years' service ; one has never been brought to hospital. I think this tolerance of opium in the native is the product of all the influences brought to bear on the Native in the course of ages. Living in a hot climate and on a vegetable diet and abstinence from alcohol are the chief conditions.

Q—Do you include the malarial constitution ?

A.—I am not sure that that gives tolerance.

Q.—You are aware of certain diseases, like diabetes, that give tolerance ?

A.—Yes, but I have not observed tolerance from malaria : though most of the people, I think, have more or less a malaria taint. Another proof of the difference of constitutions is to be found in the immunity of the Natives of India from typhoid fever. Dr. Harvey tells me that he has seen typhoid fever in natives, the diagnosis being confirmed by the *post mortem*, but he refers to a time long past. Typhoid fever in a Native is extremely rare. A Native medical student may go through the whole of his curriculum without ever seeing a case of typhoid fever. Dr. Gibbons, who has been Pathologist in the Medical College for the last seven or eight years has never seen the evidence of typhoid fever in a native in a *post mortem* examination, whereas in the General Hospital, which is open to Europeans and Eurasians, there are from ten to twenty cases in a year. I have never treated a Native for typhoid fever.

Q.—Do you say the same in regard to scarlet fever ?

A.—Yes, but that exemption applies also to Europeans. I have seen only one unquestionable case of scarlet fever in a European in India.

Q.—Have you made a special study of the effects of smoking opium ?

A.—I have made it a special study. The evil effects are considerably greater than anything that can be attributed to eating opium. This is due chiefly to the conditions under which it is smoked. It is smoked in clubs or, till recently, in opium dens. It is a social vice, like drinking alcohol, and the consequence is that opium-smoking is a vice of younger

people. I believe that *madak*-smoking is more deleterious than *chundu* smoking. I have visited several shops of both kinds during the last three or four years, and have come to the conclusion that *madak* smoking does lead to greater evils than *chundu* smoking. I have made six or eight visits to them at different times. The taking of opium does deteriorate the morals of those who indulge in it; but on public morality the effect is absolutely *nil*; it gives rise to no violent crimes. You may live within a short distance of an opium den without knowing that it is there. I lived in Dacca seven years, and did not know of the existence of a smoking den there.

Q.—Smoking in India is a habit of the lower classes?

A.—It is decidedly so. I don't know any well-to-do or respectable men who smoke opium; but they eat opium constantly. I am speaking of Hindus and Mahommedans, inhabitants of Bengal.

Q.—You have no experience of the Chinese as opium smokers?

A.—Not of any value.

Q.—What do you think is the reason why the people take opium in this country?

A.—The majority do not begin till their vital powers are failing—say betwcen the ages of forty and fifty; and then it is nsually on the advice of their elders who recommend them to take it to improve their health. I know of a native patient who is suffering from heart-disease, and was constantly urged by members of his family to adopt the habit; they tell him to take it for his stomach's sake and for his often infirmities.

Q.—But among the poorer classes?

A.—They take it as a protection against chills, and it is taken also as a preventive of diarrhœa and dysentery, the result of chills; also in large doses in the treatment of diarrhœa and dysentery; and it is very frequently used in asthma and diabetes; also as a prophylactic, and in the treatment of malarial fever.

Q.—Do you agree with the opinion that the excessive use of opium is apt to reduce the fertility of the villagers?

A.—I am unable to give an independent opinion on that point, but there is evidence in support of that view, especially that of Dr. Vincent Richards. I ought to say something more about malaria. The first point which struck me in India was the rooted and unreasonable objection which natives have to be treated with quinine; even now one has to prescribe quinine under a synonym. Often one finds out that the objection is not unreasonable, that the majority of cases of fever in Lower Bengal are of a

kind which is not only not benefited by quinine, but aggravated by it; and we are able clinically to distinguish those cases which are aggravated in this way. This is the common experience of all medical men in India.

Q.—A solution of quinine would not replace opium?

A.—No, not at all; but opium gives considerable relief. Dr. Birch, late Principal of the Medical College, who suffered considerably from fever, got such relief from opium as he never got from any other drug. Brunton, a great authority on therapeutics, mentions the case and gives reasons for it, and so does Garrod; they both mention cases in which the treatment of malaria with opium is beneficial. The same opinion prevails in the fen country in England where people use large quantities of opium both for the prevention and treatment of malaria.

Q.—Now, as to opium being a cause of crime, what is your opinion on that point?

A.—My opinion is that it is not the cause of violent crime or brutality. Alcohol is a cause of brutality; and *ganja* of sudden and uncontrolled violence. Chevers gives one case of *amok*, which was attributed to opium. In all my experience as a Jail Officer and Superintendent of a Lunatic Asylum, and as an expert relating to criminal lunatics, I have never known a case of running *amok* caused by the effects of taking opium. In my experience it is uniformly caused by *ganja*. I know a case of a young Bengali who indulged in a single *ganja* debauch, and, when he returned home that night, slew seven of his own relatives. Cases of killing three or four neighbours under the influence of *ganja* are quite common, but they are invariably produced by *ganja*, and not by opium.

Q.—What do you say of the practicability of limiting the use of opium to purely medical purposes?

A.—I believe those who make a suggestion of that kind are not acquainted with the lives and habits of the people. It presupposes that there are places scattered all over the country where opium can be obtained under medical advice, and that there are medical men available everywhere who are capable of giving that advice with discretion; also that there are means of communication available at all places. I think it is desirable that the Commission should know something of the conditions of life obtaining in parts such as that I have lived in during the greater part of my service—I mean Eastern Bengal. There, when a man wants to build a house, he first digs a tank, and with the earth he raises a mound, and on the top of that mound places his house. The elevation of the mound depends upon the height to which the annual

floods rise, which they do with fair regularity, but sometimes they rise two or three inches higher than the average, and then the inmates have to live on rafts ; they paddle about on rafts made of plantain stems. Some of the dwellings are extremely isolated, having no other habitations within four or five miles, and no native doctors within miles, and to deprive these people of the ability to get opium except under medical advice would cause a terrible amount of suffering. It is the only medicine available to them of any value, and I should not like to be the person who would deprive them of it. In most cases the only practitioner available is the Civil Hospital Assistant, educated in one of our Vernacular schools, but his advice is of no value as to the giving of opium on purely medical grounds ; they are very poor, and to them a matter of four or eight annas or a rupee would be sufficient to enable any man to obtain opium. Again, here in Calcutta, which swarms with practitioners, with hospitals in every direction where the people can obtain fair medical advice, it is a fact that fifty per cent. of the population do without any medical attendance whatever ; statistics to this effect were obtained by the Health Office of Calcutta in 1891, and will be found at page five of his report. If it is fifty per cent. in Calcutta, it is seventy-five per cent. in country districts, and instead of restricting the use of opium more than it is already, I think every household in this part of the world ought to have opium for use in cases of emergency. I myself never travel without opium and, even whan I came out from England this time, my wife provided me with laudanum before I started, though I did not have occasion to use it. I wish to add that I am Consulting Physician to the E. I. Railway Company, and I have obtained figures of the number of their native employès. The number of employés is 850 Europeans, 525 East Indians, and 39,750 natives. I have been Consulting Physician for five years, and all the reports from the different medical officers of the districts are submitted to me half-yearly. During these years the name of opium-eater does not appear in any report, and I find that opium does not come before them, either professionally or officially, though the line passes through opium-growing dictricts. No mention whatever is made upon the point, with the exception that several native doctors had sometimes pointed out to them patients who were opium-eaters, though they were unable to discover the fact.

Q.—From your own knowledge do you know whether railway servants have been dismissed owing to the habit ?

A.—I asked Mr. Wagstaff, who has been in the head office for twenty-eight years, and the reply he gave was this :—"During the twenty-eight years I have been in the office here, I don't remember a single case being reported of a Native of any grade being unfit for his duty owing to the use of opium." I am also, in another capacity, Surgeon to three of the Emigration Agencies which send coolies to the West Indies, the majority of whom are recruited from the N.-W. P., and a considerable proportion from Behar. During the last six years 48,170 coolies have been despatched to the West Indies. The proportion sent is, 100 males, 42 women and 55 children, which leaves 32,000 men or adults. During these five or six years, it has only come to my knowledge, two or three times, that the man I was examining was an opium-eater. It has not been because I discovered it myself, but because he asked for opium, and then it was discovered he was an eater ; as regards his physical condition, he was not to be distinguished from the other coolies. I may mention that every coolie sent is examined by medical men up-country, then by the ship Surgeon, and Inspector of Emigration, all of whom have been medical men. Yet we send a considerable number of opium-eaters to the West Indies. It is against the rules to send opium-eaters, and yet we are utterly unable to detect opium-eaters when we send them. I have made enquiries in reference to the opium question. I have had a great deal of conversation with opium-eaters, smokers, and people who are neither, and I think there is a consensus of opinion amongst all these, including the opium-smokers themselves, that *chundu* and *madak* manufactories should be abolished. I distinguish between that and the abolition of the opium trade. I think that measure is absolutely futile, and that it will have no effect whatever upon the consumption of *madak* and *chundu*. There is as much opium consumed in Calcutta now as before the opium dens were closed. There would be a little discontent amongst Chinamen, but they are a small number, and what would happen would be that the majority of those who now smoke would eat it. There is no question, I think, that they would avail themselves of this comparatively harmless way of using opium. As regards the trade with China what people ask is, What benefit there would be by such prohibition ? and I believe there is a universal belief that the prohibition of opium except for medical use would lead to the increased use both of alcohol and *ganja*. There is a suspicion, which I know to be absolutely unfounded, that the whole of the agitation against opium has been got up in the interest of the English liquor traffic. That I have heard repeatedly, and there is no doubt that the belief is very

widespread. I may mention that this very morning I received a letter from a missionary whom I have known for a considerable number of years, which I should like to read in confirmation of that opinion. He is a resident of this part of India. He says :—"I have seen no convincing evidence why the Government should deprive the people of opium. I have seen the ill-effects of *ganja* and alcohol both here and in Calcutta, and I have failed to discover the ill-effects of opium. I believe any attempt to deprive the people of this country of that stimulant would prove as abortive as any attempt to deprive the people at home of their beer and their pipe. It was said in a tram-car yesterday that the Government was trying to make the people give up opium for alcohol, that the Government was trying to make the people here what the English people are. 'What is that ?' I asked. Quick as lightning, the reply came, 'Drunkards'"

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Do you receive any complaints from the West Indies with regard to the inefficiency of the opium-eating coolies ?

A.—It is made a matter of complaint by the Colonial Government, but I don't know their reasons.

Q.—Do you infer that, in consequence of this habit, they are inefficient labourers ?

A.—That is the evidently the opinion held in the West Indies.

Q.—Does the moderate use of the drug impair a man's capacity for labour ?

A.—The moderate use certainly does not.

Q.—Do you make a special recommendation that the preparation of *madak* and *chundu* should be forbidden ?

A.—I should not be sorry to see that done. I should go further, and say it would be a good thing for the people who indulge in smoking opium, if this were put a stop to with a high hand.

Q.—Is the manufacture carried on under Government licenses ?

A.—It is ; smoking opium is now carried on privately in clubs.

Q.—You think these licenses should not be given ?

A.—I should be glad to think they were stopped.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—*Chundu* could be introduced from China ?

A.—It could, and it can be made in India, but it is rather difficult to make ; it is made in quantities, and only people able to afford to buy a large quantity at a time could make it. The possession of a large quantity, I believe, is illegal.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—You have expressed your opinion as to the difference between *madak* and *chundu:* please state them more fully?

A.—I think that the class of people who smoke *madak* are of a lower moral standard and general physique than those who smoke *chundu.* I have seen more *madak* smokers, with deteriorated health without apparent cause, than I have seen *chundu* smokers. Yet, I have seen *madak* smokers who have smoked for twenty years retain a good physique; but still, a very considerable proportion are men of poor physique and a very low moral standard. I am unable to explain why *madak* should be more deleterions than *chundu.* Nevertheless, whether it is from some difference in the preparation, or whether it is because it is smoked in dreadfully hot places I think I could recognise a habitual smoker without difficulty. I could not detect an opium-eater. I don't think I could detect a *chundu* smoker; but I think I could easily tell a *madak* smoker.

Q.—Do *chundu* smokers belong to the same race?

A.—They are of the same, both Hindus and Mahommedans; but I think the *madak* smoker is of lower social grade.

Q.—Do you think that opium has less effect upon people here than in England?

A.—I am not quite sure of that; but my impression is that we give more opium here than in England.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—You said you always take opium with you when you travel; is that for malarial fever?

A.—I had diarrhœa and cholera chiefly in my mind.

Q.—In reference to the coolies you send to the West Indies, many of them are from the N.-W. Provinces?

A.—A large proportion come from there.

Q.—Who pays for their passage?

A.—There are local agents, who are supplied with money, and who send them down.

Q.—If an opium-eater were sent down, who would lose upon him?

A.—The agent here would lose.

Q.—I have a statement here from a medical practitioner at Sohagpur, an M.R.C.P., a Parsee, who says that, in his opinion, as many as fifty per cent. of deaths among native children arise from eating opium?

A.—I can say nothing about what happens in the Central Provinces I have only experience of Lower Bengal and Burma.

Q.—Will you state a little more about the opium dens you visited.

A.—Perhaps I may read to you an account of one of these visits, which has been condensed in the *Indian Medical Gazette*. I had a companion with me to verify its accuracy, so that it may be taken as an absolutely accurate account of that visit : "I visited the same opium den on the evening of Sunday, the 1st May, 1892. I had visited it the previous evening in company with the Assistant Commissioner of Police, and a European constable. I have to make a confession, which is, that I had read such a terrible amount of opium essays that I considered it unsafe to go alone ; and went there under the protection of the police. I found that that was altogether unnecessary. I was accompanied by Dr. Walsh, the Resident Surgeon of the European General Hospital. The big shop where there was opium smoking was not so occupied as on the previous evening. The further end was occupied, and only three opium lamps were burning, and round these were grouped fifteen men ; one, it was evident, was smoking a *hookah* of tobacco ; only three men men were smoking opium, sitting and talking. I may say it is somewhat exceptional to find men in the habit of taking opium asleep in the opium den. I found, however, two or three men asleep, all, with one exception, Mahommedans, the exception being a Hindu Twelve out of the fifteen men were strong muscular men. One man of sixty-four, when the subject was broached, was loud in his denunciation of the opium habit. He had smoked for thirty-two years, and when it was pointed out to him that he was in very fair condition, he explained that that was due to his having always plenty to eat. There was a very general consensus of opinion that, under some circumstances, the opium habit was very pernicious, but when there was ability to take nourishing food, the habit was harmless enough. Another was a man of fifty-six or sixty who had been smoking for thirty years. He was a thatcher, and after his day's work came there. He had been there for three years, and he appeared intelligent, truthful, and bright. A deafmute, though not in the same rude health as others, was still in fairly good condition ; one individual looked much below the others, but that seemed to be due to his not having had much to eat. They said, "Look at us, you find us here after twelve years' opium-smoking ; if we had been drinking like the sahibs, we should have been quarrelling and fighting." We went behind the counter and took a pipe, but without any result whatever. Whilst we were behind the counter, Dr. Walsh told us that some twelve persons had come to purchase *chundu*. It was sold to them at the usual cost of three annas."

Q.—Was the consumption prohibited at the time ?

A.—Not at that time. I visited the same place on Thursday evening with yourself and we saw the sale of *chundu* going on very actively. We asked to be shown the process of smoking it. There was one man asleep, but we were assured that he was not an opium-smoker, and another man lying in bed, but he was suffering from colic. In the premises behind, this description was not applicable. It was divided into rooms, and in each room there were one or two divans. There were three or four of these rooms which were each capable of accommodating four or five men, but there was nobody in them. When questioned, the Chinaman said it was reserved for their own employees. There were four Chinamen behind the counter ; there was one taking the cash, another collecting, and about three or four employed in making *chundu*. The room was about fourteen feet by fifteen feet. There were three or four servants, one of them smoking, in which he was assisted by one of the others. There was one woman, who was asleep. One of the men frequenting the place was in extreme bad health. He was a wreck ; but I had no opportunity of examining whether he was an opium wreck. *Chundu* must be apparently smoked by three or four people. A *chundu* pipe, when new, costs one rupee, but when it is old and seasoned, it costs from four to six rupees. They smoke, not only for the effects of the opium, but also for flavour ; and that might be their reason for clubbing together to smoke through only one pipe. They stated that they purchased the opium at the shop close by. The occupier of the club stated that he made his profit entirely out of the refuse which was obtained from the pipes, and gained nothing from the smokers. The contents of the pipes were gathered, and he sold it to the *chundu* makers, as it seems to be necessary that, to make *chundu*, the refuse should be used. We had a conversation with several of the people, many of whom were opium smokers, and many of whom were not, and the general feeling was in condemnation of the habit in question. Even opium smokers admitted this, and would give it up if they could do so.

Q.—Do you think that an opium smoker would be employed in a position of responsibility ?

A.—I think he would be so employed ; it would be no bar. The most intelligent servants in India are, many of them, opium-eaters ; men who do the work in big offices, three out of four of them are opium-eaters.

Q.—In reference to the death of children, does the system of registration of deaths enable you to ascertain the causes of death ?

A.—There are no means of getting at the truth. I used to make it a point to go round the villages in my tours, and enquire at each village; I used to take notes, go to the police office, and compare them with the registers kept there, and found that they did not tally. The system in Calcutta is explained in the report of the Health Officer. The returns I referred to were taken at the burning ghats by agents of the Municipality and at police stations. I may add that fifty per cent. of the people die without any medical attendance whatever.

Q.—Do you think that the people of Bengal would ask to be supplied with opium as a remedy against fever?

A.—They never ask me for it, because it is available to them without asking.

Q.—Would you prefer it to quinine in malaria?

A.—I have never prescribed it in malaria. If I were staging in a malarious district I would take with me quinine, but I would also take opium.

By Mr. Mowbray:—Q.—In regard to opium-eating coolies, I understand the restriction is imposed by the Colonial Government?

A.—Yes, that is one of the conditions under which we work.

Q.—I also understand that if the matter was within your discretion, you would not impose any such restriction?

A.—I would not. If I employed coolies, I would not enquire into the subject of their being opium-eaters.

Q.—Referring to your visit to the *chundu* shop; there is no special exception in favour of *chundu* shops for Chinamen in Calcutta?

A.—Not as to shops; this was spoken of as their private residence.

Q.—The manufacture of *chundu* can only be carried on under a license?

A.—I believe so; when you have to make a small quantity, it is open to any one to make it; but it is difficult to make it except in large quantities.

Q.—If you prohibit the license, you would prohibit the manufacture of *chundu*, too?

A.—That is my belief.

Q.—At present they manufacture under a license, whether for sale or domestic use?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Therefore, by refusing to grant licenses, you would make the manufacture illegal?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You are disposed to recommend it?

A.—Yes, in regard to *chundu* and *madak*.

Q.—You say you were two years in Rangoon, have you formed any opinion as to the case in regard to Burma, as compared with your experience in India?

A.—I have not had sufficient experience of Burma to make it of any value.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—You state the opium-eating habit is a habit which is taken up in advanced life; this remark applies to Eastern Bengal and Calcutta?

A.—Yes, Eastern Bengal and Calcutta.

Q.—From the result of your experience, opium is common in most houses as a domestic remedy?

A.—I would not say it was common, for I believe if a great many houses were searched, no opium would be found. If repressive measures were used, they would very soon become oppressive; so that people requiring opium for legitimate purposes, for disease as well as for old age, would be unable to get it.

Q.—It is commonly used as a domestic remedy in Eastern Bengal?

A.—I believe it is.

By Mr. Wilson:—Q.—What was the nationality of most of the people in the opium dens?

A.—They were Mahommedans unquestionably; I did not take any note of their nationality. I saw no Chinamen inside the clubs. I think that nine out of the ten present were Mahommedans.

Q.—The Chinamen you saw said that the platform or divans were for the benefit of those employed there. Were you convinced of the accuracy of that statement?

A.—I only saw a certain number of men there, but I don't know how many men were employed.

Q.—It was an explanation given to you of what was, *primâ facie*, an illegal position?

A.—I have no ground for saying that it was illegal at all.

Evidence of Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel J. O'Brien, Professor of Surgery and Descriptive Anatomy at the Calcutta Medical College Hospital.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—You have had many opportunities habit?

A.—I have had fair opportunities of doing so, especially when serving as Civil Surgeon in large districts in Bengal. I was Civil Surgeon in Burdwan for three or four years and served at Shahabad for eighteen months.

Q.—Did you see a good deal of the opium habit?

A.—I had numerous opportunities of observing it, as I lived amongst the opium-eating races in a greater or less degree. It is somewhat more in Behar than in Lower Bengal, but the frequency of this habit was obtruded on my notice. Amongst moderate eaters, in my opinion, it would be impossible to recognise it. You may as well expect to recognise whether a man drank tea or coffee. When opium is taken in moderation, it has no ill effects upon the constitution.

Q.—When an excess is taken?

A.—I must premise by saying that all I was referring to was the eating of opium; I have had no experience of smoking, because I am not aware that it is smoked at all in the towns in which I have served. I was consulted most extensively by Natives, and I know that they eat opium. I attended dispensaries every day, at which an average of three hundred patients were treated. I know a considerable number ate opium, but it was exaggerated. The number of adult males who use opium in a malarial district like Burdwan don't exceed five per cent of the total population. I never knew a young opium-eater.

Q.—Do you agree with in the evidence given by Drs. Harvey and Crombie?

A.—I substantially agree with all that has been said by Dr. Harvey, because his experience was limited to opium-eating. Dr. Crombie gave a good deal about smoking about which I know nothing. There is another point upon which Dr. Harvey gave his opinion, that the people use opium in larger doses generally in this country. I have had no such experience. I have confined my doses to doses according to those administered at home. Of late days, as my experience has enlarged in the treatment of fever, I have come to recognise what Dr. Crombie has stated of its advantages over quinine in many cases, and the remarkable benefits derived from the use of opium. In 1882, when malarial fever

was prevalent in the last quarter of the year, it decimated the people, who died at the rate of twelve per cent, as well as I remember. Every single European was laid down. At the time, I had as my assistant a medical practitioner of great intellectual powers and high professional ability. He was a very weakly man, tall and thin, with a little, poor physique. This man escaped through all this illness. I asked him how it was he had escaped, and he said he took three or four grains of opium a day. I have also known an opium-eater who had eaten over a hundred grains of opium, daily, for twenty-four years. Another man, a respectable gentleman, connected with the Burdwan Raj, holding a high position in the Raj, who died lately at the age of seventy-five, used to take over 100 grains daily. He was well-nourished, active, rarely ill, and escaped from the malaria so much prevalent. He did not suffer in any degree from malaria. As I look back upon twenty-three years' service, I can only recollect about three or four cases of pronounced opium cachexia.

By Lord Brassey.—Q.—From your experience, can you say that the consumers of opium in moderation were many and the immoderate eaters few.

A.—Moderate consumers form the vast majority.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—In Bengal, opium is a domestic remedy ; do people keep it in their houses ?

A.—I think they purchase it when they want it.

Q.—You are the medical adviser to an insurance association, what is your opinion as to accepting the lives of opium-eaters ?

A.—My experience in connection with the association is, that very few acknowledge the opium habit, and I have no means of detecting it. There is no evidence of it upon the physique. One question is, Do you smoke *ganja* or opium ? and everybody says, "No," but, perhaps, one in a hundred would acknowledge it. The sub-agents would never bring in a case of a pronounced opium-eater, he would be stopped before he came to me.

Q.—Practically, except for the question being in the proposal form, you cannot recognise the effects in reference to insurance companies.

A —I don't recognise it, because I don't see it.

Q.—The point is, whether the company would equally accept a man for insurance if he took opium.

A.—For my part, if I was told that a man was a moderate eater I would feel inclined to pass him. No such case has really come before me. If a man took four grains, I would not consider that to be much.

Q.—Speaking of your practice in Burdwan, did you give opium to people for fever ?

A.—We don't give opium for fever, unless insomnia occurs.

Q.—Did you recommend it to those under your charge as a prophylactic ?

A.—I never did so; but I know it was greatly used as a prophylactic.

Q.—Do people in Burdwan employ it to cure fever ?

A.—They employ it as a prophylactic.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—You agree with the last two witnesses, not only as to the effects of opium, but as to their impracticability of limiting the sale to what is a recognised medical purpose?

A.—I think it would be absolutely impossible, and it would give rise to smuggling and difficulties of all sorts.

Evidence of Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel J. F P. McConnell, Professor of Materia Medica in the Medical College Hospital, Calcutta.

Q.—By Sir W. Roberts :—You have had opportunities of observing opium consumption in India?

A.—My opportunities have been practically confined to Calcutta, where I have served during the whole time.

Q.—Has your experience been confined to any class or grade in society?

A.—It has extended to all grades. I have been connected with one of the largest Native hospitals here, and my practice, as a consultant, has been one of the largest amongst Natives.

Q.—Tell us how far the habit in Calcutta prevails?

A.—I have never inquired into the matter particularly, but I should say, roughly speaking, about one per cent. of adults, not more than that, I mean there is not more than one person out of every hundred who takes opium, rich or poor.

Q.—In the cases you have observed, when opium was used habitually what was the result?

A.—Where it is used habitually and where the use was moderate, it resulted in no harm, moral or physical.

Q.—Have you seen opium used in excess ; what effect has excess upon health?

A.—I have seen it used in excess in a few cases, only three or four, and in those cases it has been first used in consequence of disease, and where it has been so used at first the habit has grown.

Q.—Do you agree until large amounts have been taken generally with the conclusions arrived at by Doctors Harvey and Crombie ?

A.—Yes, as far as opium-eating is concerned ; I have had no experience of smoking.

Q.—By Mr. Pease :—In the paper you have put in, you advocate restrictions upon the abuse of opium ; have you any suggestions in regard to restricting the sale of opium?

A.—I don't know how it will be carried out, but I think it will be desirable.

Q.—You say it is necessary to prevent the occurrence of suicide ?

A.—The number of cases of suicide by opium is very great. The drug can be easily purchased. There is some sort of restriction on the sale of opium. I understand that a person could not buy more than a rupee's worth of opium at a shop, but it is very easy for a person to go to half-a-dozen shops and purchase a rupee's worth of opium at each shop. A rupee's worth of opium would be about two hundred and fifty to two hundred and sixty grains. About eight or ten grains of opium is sufficient to kill a person. A man who takes opium in moderation would require a larger dose to kill him than a man who did not take opium. Last year I find that I had in my wards fifty-two cases of opium poisoning out of ninety-two.

The President here intimated that there was no use questioning the witness further upon this point, as the Government had agreed to present certain statistics on the matter.

Evidence of Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel R C. Sanders, Professor of Opthalmic Medicine and Surgery in the Calcutta Medical College, and Superintendent of the Mayo Hospital.

Q.—By Sir William Roberts : Have you paid special attention to the opium habit ?

A.—I have noticed people pretty carefully, in the North West Provinces, who admitted having taken opium, but I never noticed any ill effects. These were moderate consumers.

Q.—Did you see many cases of disease, where the dose was increased?

A.—I think, as people get a little older, they take slightly increased doses, but they don't increase it to a very large extent. It is quite an exception to see a man taking large doses.

Q.—Have you seen any injurious effects following in excess of the habit ?

A.—I have never seen any cases of decided excess.

Q.—Do you agree in the conclusions arrived at by Doctors Harvey and McConnell?

A.—I agree with their evidence in their entirety, though I don't know much about smoking. Dr. Crombie brought forward the common opinion amongst people, that the Opium Commission has to do with distilleries in Europe. Within the last three days, in five different places, I have heard it said that the whole question has been brought up to get more spirits imported into this country. I have tried my best to deny it absolutely, but there is that opinion, and I have no doubt that that opinion will increase.

By Mr. Wilson. Q.—I think you are the author of a book on malaria?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I have a copy of that before me published in 1880. Do you adhere to the views therein expressed or have you modified them materially since you wrote that book?

A.—I have to some extent modified them. I have had 13 years' more experience.

Q.—You say in the second chapter :—"The opium-eater enjoys considerable immunity from malarial affections, in the early stage. The first few years of indulgence in the habit, before organic visceral changes are set up to the general shattering of constitution results, which prematurely break down the consumer of opium to render him an easy prey to diseases of every kind." And futher on there is something of the same kind as to the opinion of other surgeons, which would look as if you thought that it did some good at the beginning, but ultimately destroyed the man?

A.—The mischievous effects of it are confined to the opium sot, the drunkard, the excessive habitual user.

Q.—You refer to the "opium-eater" which would hardly convey the impression of an opium sot?

A.—It is to be taken with that meaning, as you will see if you look at the context. I desire it to be so taken.

Q.—Further on you say—"The prevalence of this habit is the curse of our jail populations in Lower Assam. No work can be got out of the long-confirmed opium-eater." That does not seem to convey to an ordinary lay reader the idea that you speak of an opium sot?

A.—It is the opium sot that I am speaking of, as will be seen from the context in the next few pages.

Q.—Further on you say—"The observations of several surgeons, of extensive experience in opium-eating regions, confirms the popular belief that the opium-eater in the early stages of the habit, while as yet not constitutionally broken by its long continuances does as a matter of fact, enjoy considerable immunity from malarial affections." I think you will agree that the term "long continuance" is hardly the same as excessive use?

A.—It means excessive and long continued use.

Q.—You quote apparently with approval to Dr. Garrod in his "Materia Medica" that "there are other remedies which possess greater anti-periodic powers without the narcotic properties." You agree with that probably?

A.—Yes.

Evidence of Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel J. Purvis.

Examined by Sir W. Roberts.—Q.—You have had considerable opportunities of observing the effects of the opium habit?

A.—I have, during my service and practice of twenty-eight years in different parts of India. I was a short time in the N.-W. P., three years in Assam, and the rest of my service has been in Bengal.

Q.—Do you consider the moderate use to have any ill effects upon health. Do people in malarial districts look upon it as at a prophylactic?

A.—That is my opinion, from the experience I have had of malaria. A great many of the people take opium to relieve themselves of fever and complications connected with malaria.

Q.—What was your experience in Assam?

A.—When I was there first I was prejudiced against the use of opium, and I thought the cases admitted into hospital were from opium, but from more experience I learnt that the people really took it to free themselves from malaria, to prolong their lives and to relieve their suffering.

Q.—You have not seen any really bad effects of it upon health?

A.—I have not seen a case in which death was due to opium except when coupled with disease. The moderate use is rather beneficial than otherwise, and if they were deterred from opium they would take to drink or *ganja* to a greater extent than at present.

Q.—Have you any other particulars to give?

A.—The great difficulty is to find out the signs of the opium habit. A great number of respectable inhabitants among the middle classes of

natives take it to a considerable extent and yet carry on their duties. Only a few days ago I met a native gentleman who said most of his friends took opium more or less, and that they had been driven to it by disease and were now doing their work in a way they never did before. I was surprised to find that all my best servants were opium eaters, where I had never suspected it. In regard to opium being a very common form of suicide, I quite agree with Dr. Harvey. No doubt in different parts of India there are different methods. The other day I asked a native gentleman his opinion whether the prohibition of opium would prevent suicide. He said the clothing would also have to be put down because there were more suicides from the ropes into which the cloth could be twisted. Out of 335 cases sent in by the police this year, there were two from drowning; six from opium; and twenty-seven from hanging. To stop the growth and sale of opium would be almost impossible, smuggling would go on.

Evidence of Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel Russell.

Examined by Sir W. Roberts.—Q.—You have had opportunities of studying the effects of opium?

A.—Considerable. I have been seven years in Lower Assam, since then in Lower Bengal, in the twenty-four Purgunnahs, Hughli, Rajshaye, Nuddea and Patna.

Q.—In your note you say that five per cent of the people are probably opium eaters?

A.—That applies to the province of Bengal.

Q.—As the total of the population or adult males?

A.—Adult males.

Q.—Have you observed any racial difference in the susceptibility to opium of the different races?

A.—No, I cannot say I have.

Q.—What is your experience of its effects on the mass of the people?

A.—I don't think the habit is confined to any special social status.

Q.—What are the effects upon the health of the consumer?

A.—I think that in the malarial districts its effects are decidedly beneficial, and lead to active habits.

Q.—You don't know of any disease produced by opium?

A.—No, I do not think that any susceptibility to disease is produced by the habitual and moderate use of opium.

Q.—Do the experiences of Drs. Harvey and Crombie coincide with your own?

A.—Yes, practically.

Q.—Have you anything to add ?.

A.—I should like to confirm what others have said, about the opinion which is extending of the connexion with the opium agitation with the distilleries at home.

Evidence of Surgeon-Major R. Cobb.

By Sir W. Roberts.—Q.—How long have you been in the service ?

A.—Seventeen years, and the greater part of that time as Civil Surgeon in Lower and Eastern Bengal. I have been in charge of many hospitals, and of the Central and District Jails, and am at present in charge of the Dacca Lunatic Asylum and the Mitford Hospital at Dacca. I have practice among the Europeans and Natives there, where I am Civil Surgeon.

Q.—How far does the opium habit extend ?

A.—I estimate 3 to 5 per cent of the Hindus of Dacca as addicted to the habit out of the whole population. It is very common. The Mahommedans of the country take it to a greater extent than the Hindus. It is taken by rich and poor.

Q.—Is there any stigma attached to the habit ?

A.—Not to the moderate use ; only to opium smoking.

Q.—It is not fashionable?

A.—The poorer classes may smoke it to some large extent.

Q.—Smoking in an ordinary pipe?

A.—There is so little going on that one does not come across it.

Q.—You have heard the evidence already given ; what is your opinion upon it ; is the habit innocuous ?

A.—I believe the moderate use of opium to be quite innocuous ?

Q.—In your district does it do good on the whole or harm?

A.—I think in a large number of cases it is essential.

Q.—You think the people's health would suffer without it ?

A.—It would deteriorate if they did not get it.

Q.—What are the ill effects if taken in excess ?

A.—I have never been able to distinguish them from the ill-effects of the special disease for which the opium was taken. Men admitted to jail who are excessive eaters beg for opium ; but I have always found these were suffering from some other chronic disease.

Q.—Have they ever been in hospital from the effects of opium eating?

A :—Never, I have never had application made for treatment for the habit. In nearly all cases the supply of opium to eaters of it is cut off when they are admitted to jail. There are a few cases in which I consider it wise to continue the habit, at any rate for a time. In the case of a moderate eater I stop it at once. The common practice is to stop it at once.

Q.—One of the witnesses said that the work done in jails by opium-eaters would be apt to fall short if the opium was withheld ?

A.—I have not noticed that except in those race cases. I think stress has not been laid upon the fact that use of moderate doses as a dietetic. Poor Natives are largely in the habit of eating rice in Eastern Bengal, and as a man advances in age digestion fails to some extent, and the food is hurried through the intestines. Opium prevents this, and is largely used among the poor.

Q.—Have you noticed constipation in opium-eaters?

A.—Not in moderate users. In advanced life it helps them to digest their food. I do not think any restrictions should be placed upon it on the contrary I think it should be got at more readily. I know very little about opium smoking.

Evidence of Surgeon Captain J. H. T. Walsh.

Examined by Sir W. Roberts.—Q.—Your experience has been confined to the Lower Provinces?

A.—Almost entirely, as Civil Surgeon of Puri and Health Officer and I am Medical Officer of the Presidency Jail here, and in charge of the Jail at Puri. That is where my experience has been, apart from regimental use and use amongst transport coolies.

Q.—Your experience is that opium is largely consumed?

A.—I believe the consumption to be very considerable. I have seen in Puri several lacs of people, during the pilgrim season going to the temples there, and amongst them opium is freely used. They are Ooriyas, the inhabitants of Orissa, and others.

Q.—Have you seen any ill effects?

A.—From the moderate use I have not seen any.

Q.—What have you observed in regard to excess in its use?

A.—It has been stated to me that certain persons in jail were inveterate eaters ; but I am utterly unable to say from the symptoms that they were suffering from the effects of opium rather than from starvation.

Q.—Have you ever made a *post mortem* of an excessive opium eater?

A.—I have made several of those who were said to have been opium eaters. There is a great difference between opium and alcohol. Opium does not cause the degeneration of one single organ in the body. There is a certain amount of congestion of the vessels of the brain, but that is from poisonous doses, and that was only a temporary, not a permanent, lesion. The use began partly from the tradition that it was useful in disease, and partly from the social habits of the people, who taking opium find soothing effects from it and come to use it, such as wine does among other people. In India the standard of health was always low, and it was used medicinally as a boon in disease. In diabetes it was used.

Q.—Have you noticed opium given to infants?

A.—Upon that point I can only refer to the general opinion as to the general custom. I have no instances to bring forward. It is generally stated that it is a common practice for mothers; and I agree with Dr. Crombie that the practice extends to Europeans, objectionable as it is. Certainly I think large doses would be injurious to European children.

Q.—Have you had much experience of the effects of the malarial diseases?

A.—In Orissa, yes. There is a large native hospital at Puri and smaller dispensaries throughout the district. Enlarged spleen is common. I have not seen infants, but I have seen young children with these enlarged spleens.

Q.—Do you agree with the evidence given by Drs. Harvey and Crombie?

A.—Generally I do. If you cut off the supply you will do more harm than good. I have one or two more points to urge. I agree entirely with Dr. Crombie as to the proper use of opium. A native diet is most indigestible, and taking opium prevents their suffering from diarrhœa. Another point is this. Every Civil Surgeon has sent to him by the Magistrate, opium which has been certificated. It is not easy to say whether it is fit for human consumption or not. It is generally adulterated with sugar or lime. It is perfectly easy to obtain opium and any attempt to prevent smuggling would be mere waste of time.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson:—You consider Orissa malarious?

A.—Yes, in parts; but parts are extremely healthy.

Q.—Do you agree with the opinion that where people are very poor opium helps them.

A.—It helps them to bear up; one must admit that it would be far better if they would buy more food and less opium; but we know what

human nature is. I think opium does help them over their difficulties, both as regards disease and the indigestibility of their food.

Q.—You referred to Puri?

A.—Yes, one of the most sacred cities in India, containing certainly the largest temple, that of Juggernath.

Q.—Is it healthy?

A.—The town itself is particularly unhealthy. It is kept away from the sea-breeze by high sandbanks, and on the other part there is a large swamp. The people are not very poor, especially in Puri. The pilgrims are very poor.

Surg.-Lt.-Col. Crombie, M.D., made the following supplementary statement:—

I wish to explain what I meant when I alluded to the stopping of the manufacture of *chandu* and *madak*. I was asked if I would advocate the stopping of the manufacture of *madak* and *chandu*. I wish to say I am not here to advocate any policy. I merely express an opinion as to the comparative deleteriousness of certain ways of using opium. When I expressed an opinion as to the closing of those places of manufacture, it had reference to the one thing which is constantly in my mind, that is, that the subject of opium is inextricably mixed up with that of alcohol. If you can close a number of *chandu* shops without increasing the consumption of alcohol, I would do so; but if there is a doubt that they would take to alcohol instead of opium, I would say leave them alone.

Mr. Alexander made the following statement:—I observe, from the evidence given this morning by Dr. Harvey, that, in my cross-examination, I failed to note an important distinction between the suggestions put to me by Sir James Lyall and those put forward by our Society in paragraph nine of its general memorial to Lord Kimberley and thus appeared to accept Sir James Lyall's view as to our proposals. We have never urged that opium should be sold only on medical certificate which would be going much beyond the law at present in force in the United Kingdom. Our proposal is that the sale of the drug should in India, as in England, be entrusted to responsible and qualified persons, with the additional provision that these persons should have no interest in the sale of the drug.

Printed by
JOSEPH CULSHAW, for the METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, Calcutta.

Pam Drugs
Opium

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part VIII. 29th November, 1893.

PRICE ONE PENNY, or ONE ANNA, for each part.

Published by the
Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade,
Broadway Chambers, London, S. W.
Also at the
Methodist Publishing House, 45, Dharamtala St., Calcutta.

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Evidence of Donald Morison, M.D.

In reply to the President, Dr. Morison said:—I have been a Medical Missionary in the town of Rampore Beauleah for about sixteen years. I have taken a deep interest in the social, moral, temporal and spiritual condition of the people. I was for years a member of the Municipality and District Board. I mention this to show that I was not indifferent to their temporal welfare; and I endeavoured to aid the Government and local bodies in every attempt made to improve the condition of the people, or alleviate their sufferings.

I have had two dispensaries under my charge for nearly all these years. I also itinerated all over the District of Rajshaye twice a year: in the rainy season, and during the cold weather, and visited the adjoining Districts of Maldah and Pubna occasionally. During the rainy season when the rivers were in flood and the rice fields inundated, I itinerated among the villages. I may say that I have during those itinerations visited more than once most parts of the District. In my double capacity as Physician and Missionary, I have been brought into the closest contact with all classes of the people, especially the poor.

During those years from six to ten thousand patients annually were treated by me.

Rajshaye District is everywhere malarious, in some parts intensely so. When fever is very severe as during September, October, and November, I have found sixty to eighty per cent of my patients suffering from malarious fevers or their complications. The use of opium is by no means common among the ryots of Rajshaye, I should say it is quite exceptional to find an agricultural labourer an opium eater. In the towns, smoking opium is prevalent among day labourers and other workmen who are disreputable, and, some of them are very young men. Opium is not used by the people of Rajshaye either as a prophylactic or for the cure of fever. My former remark applies to the districts of Maldah, Pubna, and, indeed. I may say to all Lower Bengal. The malarial theory so diligently put forward to account for the prevalence of the habit of opium eating is not founded in my opinion on actual ascertained facts. I am absolutely sure that it is purely mythical as regards Lower Bengal.

Q.—Have you anything to say as regards the view which is taken among the people with whom you have been in contact in Lower Bengal as to the opium habit. Is it regarded as a disgraceful habit?

A.—The habit of using opium in young people is always considered a disgraceful thing: in elderly people it is excused on the general ground of failing natural powers.

Q.—Would you say that the use of opium was common?

A.—It is by no means true to say that as a rule elderly people take to opium. Among Mahommedans, a few headmen in villages, a few shop keepers, tailors, merchants, and house-servants generally in European employ, take to the habit; and among Hindoos a few elderly people. That it is considered disreputable in most cases, is manifest from the secrecy with which they eat it, and the fear they have of being branded as "opium-eaters."

Q.—Have you any explanation as to when the habit is first contracted?

A.—Young men begin it from vicious habits, or from seeing others take it. Old men or middle-aged men from forty to fifty years begin the habit by taking it to restore or revive the failing natural powers.

Q.—Is opium used as a domestic remedy?

A.—It is used very little, if at all as a domestic remedy in Rajshaye; but I have seen men who began it on account of chronic rheumatic pains—pains of various kinds common to the labouring classes in all countries. Some begin it for pleasure, some for pain, others from curiosity, most from the contagion of bad example; but I never heard of it being recommended by any doctor, European or Native, either to ward off or cure malaria; and, as I have stated above, the people themselves never take to it as a 'prophylactic.'

Q.—Do you consider as a medical man that the use of opium is generally injurious?

A.—I consider that no one can take to eating it without increasing the dose, and suffering deterioration of bodily vigour. The progress may be slow, and undoubtedly is so in some cases, but in the majority of cases emaciation is speedily manifested, and the bodily vigour deteriorates. The opium-smoker is so demoralised that his very surroundings suggest how low he has fallen; but the opium-eater with ample means keeps up a fair exterior for years. The poor man cannot afford suitable food to counteract the injurious effects of the opium, but must encroach upon his already too scanty meal to supply his unnatural craving.

Q.—Have you anything further to say with reference to the use of opium from a medical point of view?

A.—I should like say something in regard to the tolerance created by the drug in the system when taken in the form of smoking or eating, and with regard to the opium given by Dr. Russell, who has been a witness before the Commission, in his book on Malaria, which was written about thirteen years ago.

[Some discussion ensued as to the desirability of quoting a passage from a work by a medical man, who had himself given evidence before the Commission. Dr. Morison was, however, allowed to continue, and read a passage from Russell on Malaria, page thirty-eight, as to the action of opium on the habituated healthy organism in producing tolerance of the drug. He also asked leave to read a passage from Sir William Roberts' book on Dietetics, page sixty-eight, as explaining why people say with such unanimity that opium-eaters must take milk if they are to resist the debilitating effect of opium. The witness was, however, not permitted to read the passage on the ground that Sir W. Roberts, being a member of the Commission, could explain what his meaning was.]

Q.—Have you anything to say as to the influence of opium-eating upon the physical energy?

A.—There is a common fallacy as to the stimulating effect of opium. It is not analogous to liquor as a stimulant. It is said that an opium-eater can do a great deal of work under the influence of opium. Among the many labourers I employed there were a great many opium-eaters, and I put the following question to two gentlemen who were in a position to form an opinion :—given two men of equal physique, one an opium-eater, the other not; would you find in your experience that the opium-eater would do more work and endure for longer hours than the other? One of these men was the captain of a ship, the other the Agent of a steamer going through in Orissa. They both said they could not say so, and the captain's distinct opinion was that opium-eaters were not able to perform the same tasks as the others.

Q.—Have you any remark to make with reference to the difficulty of giving up the habit when once acquired?

A.—The difficulty of giving up the habit is very great, and to a Native of Bengal almost insuperable, but some have given it up. I have experience of attempts that are made by many opium-eaters, and I find in my notes of a native Christian suffering from disease of the bones of the leg (Tibia) who was recommended to abandon opium-eating by a doctor

in Calcutta; he would not give up the habit, and died a confirmed opium-eater. The second case was that of a young man in my service as a dispenser; as long as he could get opium, he would do his work, but not satisfactorily; and when urged to give up the habit he said he would rather give up work than undergo the agony. While I was in Orissa, I heard of an opium-eater of the name of Rundoo, a native Christian in Cuttack, forty or forty-five years of age. He was a day labourer, but he became feeble, and could no longer work. When he could no longer get opium, he committed suicide by hanging himself. The fourth case was a case in Glasgow, of a man who consulted Dr. Garrow Leeds, who told me the incident; the man endeavoured again and a gain to give up the habit, but failed, and then delivered himself up to Dr. Garrow Leeds. He confined him in a padded room like a lunatic, took away his opium, and cured him in eight or ten days.

Q.—Have you any experience as to the effects of opium on children?

A.—I was lately told of a case in which an officer of the Bengal Medical Service gave a child an overdose of opium, and he died. I think that we medical men ought not to depart from the instructions we have received from our Professors of Materia Medica, that the result of giving opium to children is always risky and dangerous. No doubt some do give it in very minute doses, but that heroic treatment cannot be calculated upon with safety, without one day regretting that they began it. There is another case in which opium was given to a child four or five years of age; the ayah gave it opium in minute doses, the child withered away and when it was on the point of death the medical officer discovered that its condition was due to taking opium. The ayah was charged before the Magistrate with poisoning the child, but I understand that had it been her own child, she would have gone without punishment, because it would not have been known that she had done it. I think there should be some control exercised over the sale of opium so that women could not possibly obtain it to drug their children. I learn that in other parts of India there is a heavy mortality from this habit.

Q.—Have you anything to say with reference to the facilities which now exist as to the system of licenses for the sale of opium?

A.—The facility with which opium can be purchased places great temptation before morally weak people; hence a great number of suicides. Only a few months ago the little town where I labour was thrown into it state of excitement by the news that a boy, sixteen years of age, had poisoned himself because he was unable to pass an examination; and quite recently, a young widow of eighteen or twenty took opium, with fatal re-

sult, on account of some domestic trouble; the third was a case which occurred only a few months previously of a woman who quarrelled with her husband and took opium, and died. I think that the sale of opium should be more restricted, so that it could not be purchased by ordinary persons.

Q.—You have said all that you had to say in your evidence-in-chief on the subject in its general aspects. I understand that you have recently visited Orissa, how long were you there?

A.—I was in Cuttack for about one whole day.

Q.—You visited Cuttack with the view of obtaining information, as far as the length of time admitted, with reference to the subject which has been referred to this Commission?

A.—Yes, that was my object.

Q.—And you desire to make a statement to us which which will represent the result of the enquiries you made at Cuttack.

A—Yes, I would like to give the evidence given to me by natives as well as Europeans both private and official in Cuttack.

[After some discussion as to the admissibility of the statement, which was objected to as being only hearsay evidence, Dr. Morison was permitted to read the following statement :—

On my way to Orissa by steamer, on the 15th November, I met on board a number of native gentlemen (Hindoos) returning to Orissa. All except one were connected with the Government. They were all men of intelligence and education. Two of them were M. A's and two had read up to the B. A. of the Calcutta University. I explained to them in a few words my object in going to Orissa. Their answers to the following questions are as follows.

Q.—Is opium generally believed to be protective against fever?

A.—No. We never heard of this before. We have overselves used tea, and quinine for fever in Bengal, but we never heard of opium being used for this purpose either in Orissa or in Bengal.

Q.—Is it in fact protective against malarial fevers?

A.—No. We have never heard of any one being advised by any medical man or native Kobiraj to take opium to prevent fever.

Q.—Is it specially useful in malarious districts, or believed to be so?

A.—No. We never heard of it being so used; and Orissa, we consider, is pecularly free from malaria as compared with Calcutta, Burdwan, Nuddea, and other parts of lower Bengal with which we are acquainted.

Q.—Is it necessary or believed to be necessary to enable working people to get through their daily toil ?

A.—No, unless the labourer is in the habit of using opium, either eating or smoking it. If an opium-eater, he cannot work without it : but if not addicted to opium he can work, we consider, better without it.

Q.—Is the habit of taking opium looked upon as disgraceful ?

A.—Smoking in old or young is always considered in Bengal and Orissa as disgraceful. The habit of eating opium by old men is not considered to be disgraceful as it is believed to be taken by them as a medicine to invigorate their bodies or to relieve pain.

Q.—What motives induce people to form the habit ?

A.—Sexual debility, and general failure of bodily vigour induce men at the age of forty-five to fifty years to begin the habit. Young people take to it from the contagion of bad example.

Q.—What are the results of the habit physically, mentally, morally ?

A.—(1) Emaciation of body is rapid if not counteracted by rich food, milk, ghee and sweetmeats. (2) Mentally—Sleepiness and dullness generally. (3) Morally—Smoking, utterly debasing, but eating less so ; probably as the eater is older in years. The use of opium we have heard leads to impotency in smokers in three to four years, in eaters five to six years.

Q—Is there a general tendency to increase the dose ?

A.—Yes, generally.

Q.—Is the habit easily relinquished either at once or gradually ?

A.—No. It is very rarely relinquished ; almost never in our experience.

These gentlemen signed the following statement.

" We deliberately state that our experience of Cuttack, and generally over most parts of Orissa, has led us to consider Orissa peculiarly free from malaria with spleen and fevers, as compared with Calcutta, Burdwan, Nuddea, and other parts of lower Bengal, with which we are acquainted. We even know some friends of ours who have settled in Cuttack, Orissa on account of its freedom from malaria. We know that in Angul, and other parts there is fever, probably malarious, but Orissa generally is not considered by us to be malarious. We are decidedly of opinion that the habit of taking opium in Orissa is not due to malaria as the people themselves do not attribute the habit to that cause."

This statement w as signed in the presence of Babu Hari Dass Bannerjee, of Calcutta, a Zamindar having estates in Orissa.

Another gentleman, a Government Official, a European, made the following statement :—

"I have been all over Orissa, visited most parts and had occasion to travel in unhealthy parts. I have resided in Balasore and Cuttack (not in Puri). It is my deliberate opinion that the excessive use of opium by the people of Orissa is not due to malaria but to one learning the habit from another. I recently had a conversation with a Deputy Collector on this point and he too was of opinion that the excessive use of opium was due to bad habit contracted by seeing others use it. I have heard it stated by the people that opium was long ago cultivated in Orissa, especially in the Balasore District. I have known gangs of workmen under me of which at the beginning only one took opium but in a few months most of the others also became opium eaters from the bad example of the first victim."

Again, on the Kendrapara Canal, a Hindoo gentleman, manager of a large state in Orissa come to me of his own accord and said "I hear you are taking evidence in connection with the opium commission." "No," I said, "I am not connected with the opium commission, but I am collecting facts regarding the opium habit of Orissa." He made the following statements in answer to my questions :—

"I am a native of Orissa. I am manager of a large estate. I am also a zamindar—I have estates of my own as well—not large. I have observed the opium habit from my youth. The habit is formed more by example than from any other cause—seeing others use it, they are led to begin it. Sometimes among the poor the habit begins in infancy. Aged people begin the habit when they feel the natural vigour abating."

Q.—"Do you mean the sexual function or the body generally."

A.—(Hesitatingly) "The body generally."

Q.—"Explain this."

A.—"I mean that among us Hindoos it is considered not so disgraceful for old people to take opium."

Q.—"Do you encourage opium eating in your family or among your servants ?"

A.—"Oh no. We take care that none of our family or servants take to opium if we can prevent them. An opium eater must have his opium, if not able to buy it he will steal petty things to get pice to buy it when nourishing food is taken, milk, ghee, sweetmeats &c. it wards off its evil effects for sometime."

Q.—"Is opium generally believed to be protective against malaria fever ?"

A.—"I have never heard of it being used for that purpose ; but quinine and cinchona are used for that purpose."

Q.—"Is it protective against malaria ?"

A.—"No. For opium eaters get fever like others: but Cuttack is not malarial."

Q.—"Is it necessary to enable working people to get through their daily toil?"

A.—"I do believe it helps men to do hard work if they are opium eaters not otherwise."

Q.—"Is the habit of using opium considered as disgraceful?"

A.—"Yes; except in old men who take it for failing health or for some ailment."

Q.—"Is it desirable to prohibit the sale of opium except for medecinal purposes?"

A.—"Yes."

Q.—"How?"

A.—"By increasing the cost to the consumer."

Q.—"Is the habit easily relinquished either at once or gradually?"

A.—"No, not easily; but I have heard of some who have given it up"

In Cuttack, on the 7th November, I was taken to see a retired Deputy Collector who is interested in this question. He said in answer to my questions :—

"I am a Hindu, a Native of Orissa. I have been for many years Deputy Collector and have had occasion to reside in Balasore and Cuttack. I never heard of opium being given to cure or ward off malaria, for here in Cuttack we have little or none. I have known families come to Cuttack from Bengal with their members suffering from spleen and fever and after residing here for some time without taking medicine they have been cured of their malarial ailments."

Q.—"Were you aware that opium was cultivated in Balasore or in any part in Orissa in the time of Warren Hastings?" "No, I was not aware of that, that may account for the prevalence of the habit. At Balasore a friend of mine, a Government official, complained to me that he could not get his clerks to work after 5 P.M. however great the pressure of work. He said all his clerks took opium, and as that was the hour when they took their opium they could not go on without it."

"Had you any experience of the Orissa famine (of 1866?)" "Yes. I was on relief works and gave the starving food."

Q.—"Did you ever hear the starving people ask for opium to alay the pangs of hunger?"

A.—(Laughing) "No, I never heard of that; their one cry was "Rice! Rice!" But I have seen many of the starving who had come in to the sudder station from the interior after they had been fed spread their cloth on the road side and lie down and die quietly. That astonished me very much; but I enquired of the doctor why it was, and he (Dr. Jackson I think) said it was

because of their having taken too much food. The people he said should have been gradually fed."

Q.—"So, you do not think the people could buy opium (a dearer article than rice) when they had no money to buy rice?"

A.—"Certainly not. He then asked me if I had seen his note on opium which he gave to Mr. A. C. Das."

I quote from that note, as follows :—

"I know of many instances in which heirs to large estates brought ruin upon themselves by smoking and eating opium: not that the expenditure attending the habit was great enough to cause the ruin: but that the vice made the man on the one hand so lethargic, and weakened their intellects so much that they almost entirely neglected the management of their estates, leaving them in the hands of their servants, who robbed them right and left; and on the other hand they were made exceedingly fond of carnal pleasures of all sorts, in which they indulged freely and most extravagantly. I have known the want of means to buy the drug turn men into thieves and burglars in numerous cases which came before me officially. People have let their wives and children starve rather than do without the drug.

"The drug is used by men of all classes everywhere in Orissa: that is to say, the use is not confined to any particular race, class or district. *It is regarded as a curse by all, except of course those who are eaters or smokers of the drug.* Anything short of total prohibition of the cultivation of the poppy, except for medicinal purposes, would be a partial measure ill calculated to save the country from the destructive effects of opium. As regards the Native states, those in Orissa draw their supplies from the Government stores; in none of these States is the poppy grown or opium manufactured. I think the sympathies of the rulers of these states could easily be enlisted in the noble cause of abstinence from this drug. There need be no special police force to detect smuggling in the case of opium in this part of the country. It would not be easy to grow the poppy or manufacture opium without being noticed by the ordinary police. The existing police force considered sufficient to prevent illicit preparation of the drug in districts under the Government would prevent its being smuggled into them from Native states where it is freely grown without any restrictions. Should the rulers of these states be induced as they easily could be to prohibit its growth in their territories the need for providing against smuggling would be reduced. The prohibitive measures recommended are not therefore likely to increase the charges on account of a detective force as far at least as Orissa is concerned.

"One of the grounds of objection is the loss of revenue to Government which would certainly result from it, supposing that such measures are enforced. I would simply answer that where body and soul are at stake, as they undoubtedly are in the case under notice, no precuniary consideration should stand in the way of reform. If opium eating and smoking is a vice, as it is on all hands admitted to be, the traffic in the drug cannot but be considered immoral. This being so, there can be no justification whatever for the Government continuing the trade for the sake of filthy lucre. The revenue derived from it every righteous man would look upon as ill-gotten money; as the gain from gambling houses and those worse than these would be. It is for the statesmen who are at the helm of Government to devise means by which the charges of governing the country could he met from legitimate sources, without having recourse to measures so immoral and so unrighteous as the opium traffic.

"Jogon Mohon Roy. *Late Deputy Collector.*"

My next visit in company with Mr. A. C. Das was to Babu——— in Government Service. He stated :

"I am a Hindoo. I have been nine years a Deputy Inspector of schools. I am a Native of Orissa and have lived all my life in Orissa. I have visited most parts of Orissa. I have had occasion to visit the malarious tracts of Orissa: but never felt any necessity to take opium. I consider the habit of opium-eating injurious. It is more prevalent in Balasore than in Puri or Cuttack. In Balasore it is given to children up to the age of ten years. I have had one such boy in my school; their parents cause the children to break off the habit at nine or ten years of age. The habit is not easily given up; I only know of two or three instances where men addicted to the habit have given it up of their own accord. Excessive consumers become rapidly emaciated if unable to get milk, ghee and sweetmeats. A smoker may and often does consume one-half his earnings in opium, moderate eaters one eighth or one-tenth of their income, if poor. There is a constant tendency to increase the dose. I have known men who began with one pice worth of opium per day and who in ten years or fifteen years increased it to ten pice per day. I consider the habit of smoking opium morally degrading; eating it makes the consumer indolent, sleepy, unreliable. I do not believe opium to be a protective against fever, nor is it ever given here for that purpose. I have resided in feverish tracts in Orissa; but never took opium. I also know a friend of mine who is frequently in these tracts, and he does not get fever and is not an opium eater. The habit of eating opium is invariably looked upon with aversion by respectable people; but smoking is always considered disgraceful. You may use my name in this matter as I am only telling the truth, and I am not afraid to tell the truth.".

Dr. Morison also read a letter from Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter' retired Judge of the High Court of Calcutta, to Mr. Alexander, stating that he and other members of his family had more than once visited Cuttack as a health resort, that the climate had never disappointed him, that Cuttack was much drier than Bengal and in his belief from free malaria.

Q.—In what way do you connect this letter with the enquiry of the Commission.

A.—As corroborative evidence that Orissa generally is not malarious, whereas it has been asserted again and again that it is extensively malarious. I have also the evidence of Mr. McMillan, who was for over thirty years executive engineer in Orissa. He says : " I was executive engineer for over thirty years, but have now retired and live in Cuttack. I have travelled over every part of Orissa, at all seasons, and along the low-lying coast-line as well as in the higher plains towards the hills. I had charge of all the Public Works in the District, and and many of the roads and bridges were designed and executed by me. I constructed that large breakwater you saw on the river as you approached Cuttack in the Steamer. I have come to know the people and their habits well. I know the malarious parts, but Orissa is not considered malarious by

those who live here. During all these forty years I have never had fever except once, and that not very severe. In all my intercourse with the people I have never heard them say that they took opium as a prophylactic, and I am sure they do not use it either to cure or to ward off fever. I have heard some say they began it for rheumatism. The habit here is merely a vice. I can remember two instances where the habit, after long continuance, was abandoned. One a good workman, a mechanic who was called "pagol" or fool, by the others on account of the effect of opium upon him. He was unreliable although naturally a good workman. He dreamt a dream, and on that account, so he said, he gave up the habit. Soon after leaving off the habit he became a steady and industrious workman, and began to look quite different in appearance—even the very colour of his face was changed—he looked fairer and become sensible and reliable. The second man a merchant and was was also called "pagol" or fool an account of his manner from excessive opium-eating. He had neglected his business and things were going to the bad, but he left it off and became a competent and prosperous man."

While I was in Cuttack there was a meeting of the Total Abstinence Society at which I asked to speak a few words, and I put the following resolution to a crowded meeting of betwcen 800 and 900 people. It is a society for the total abstinence from drugs and alcohol as well. The following is the resolution:—

Resolved, "At a public meeting of the Total Abstinence Society of Cuttack convened on the subject of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors and drugs, we hear with surprise that the cause of opium-eating and smoking so prevalent in Orissa is due to malaria. We believe the habit to be due to bad example, so contagious an evil, and we have never heard of opium being used either to prevent the influence of malaria or to cure an attack of malarious fever in Orissa.

(Signed) A. H. Young, Chairman.

(Signed) A. C. Dass, Secretary.

A meeting of the Baptist Missionary Conference happened to be held at the time of my visit, at which I was present, when the following resolution was passed:—"We, the Baptist Missionaries from various parts of Orissa at present in Conference assembled, hereby affirm what we have hitherto acted upon, that opium-eaters or smokers are not eligible for baptism or admission into church fellowship in any of our churches scattered throughout Orissa."—Alex. H. Young, Chairman. *Cuttack, 18th November, 1893.*

The Conference represented a Christian community of from 2000 to 3000 members.

Q.—Having dealt with the general question and your experience in Lower Bengal as well as your visit to Orissa, is there any other point on which you would like to speak?

A.—I should like to have discussed the question whether malaria is the real cause of the excessive consumption of opium in Orissa. That this theory has been accepted by the Government of India will be proved from the following extract from the Blue Book on the consumption of opium in India presented to both Houses of Parliament in 1892. In their despatch the following sentence occurs, " We reserve our remarks on this question, that is the question of the closure of shops for consumption on the premises, till the concluding paragraph of this despatch, and it is only necessary to say that we regard the effects in Bengal as on the whole satisfactory. When the enormous area and population are considered, and further it is recognised how large a proportion of that area consists of alluvial malarious tracts in which the use of opium by the people is not a vice or even a luxury, but to some extent a necessity of life."

I had occasion to bring this matter before the Anti-Opium Society in London when a discussion was held on the 31st May, 1892, on the medical aspects of the opium question. I stated in that discussion that the assertion that the use of opium as a prophylactic accounts for the excessive consumption of opium in Assam and Orissa, and is due to the fact that those tracts are more malarious than other parts of India, and that it is taken as a prophylactic by the ryots is incorrect. And I further stated that there are three outstanding facts which showthat that the above theory is not the true one. First, that there are many districts in Bengal which are as malarious as Orissa and Assam, and which did not consume opium in anything like the proportion of those oft-quoted districts. I instance the district of Rajshaye which I know well, and some parts of which have been depopulated by malaria, yet opium is not consumed there by the people as a whole. Secondly, that malaria is not confined to malarious tracts, which it would be if the malarial theory was true, either as regards India or China. In both these countries people who live in parts comparatively free from malaria are excessive consumers of opium. Thirdly, high above the malarial zone, where malaria is endemically unknown, opium is consumed to excess. In such places as Simla, the highest town in the Himalaya Range, we find the habit established, and the drug consumed to excess. It seems clear from these facts, that, whatever causes have brought about the excessive consumption of opium in Assam

and Orissa, it is not malaria alone. We must find causes equally applicable to other parts of India, very different in climate, race, social habits, and religious restrictions.

Dr. Watts, in his article which has been handed in to the Commission, mentions that the cultivation of the poppy at one time existed in Orissa, and that the "East India Company ordered that its cultivation should be restricted to Patna and Benares." The evidence I have obtained from Orissa enables me to say that the following points as far as Orissa is concerned have been proved. First, that Orissa, instead of being a malarial district, as generally believed, is a sanitarium for Bengal, and that persons afflicted with bad health go there for improvement; secondly, that opium is not taken as a prophylactic, and that the people do not entertain that view in Orissa; thirdly, that it is not taken by people as a cure for fever; fourthly, that opium-eaters are at least as liable to malarial fever as non-opium-eaters; fifthly, that it is considered to be a curse by all intelligent natives who have the welfare of the people at heart; and sixthly, that the Balasore district where opium was cultivated, as might be expected, is most deeply tainted with the vice.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—Are you acquainted with a book on Malaria by Dr. Russell, which has been mentioned?

A.—I am.

Q.—Is there anything in that book which confirms or contradicts your views?

A.—I think there are things in that book which confirm my views.

Q.—Will you refer to them?

A.—Speaking of opium-eaters, he says: "The opium-eater obtains considerable immunity from malarious affections in the early stages. The first few years of indulgence in the habit, before the organic visceral changes are set up, and the general shattering of constitution results, which prematurely break down the consumer of opium, and render him an easy prey to diseases of every kind." He then goes on to say: "In the plains of Assam this habit is almost universal. In this district the writer has made a series of exact observations on the prevalence of this habit among the large circulating population of the jail. He finds that nearly four-fifths of the men of the plains who enter jail are more or less addicted to this habit, consuming from five grains to three drams of the drug daily.....The prevalence of this habit is the curse of our jail population in Lower Assam. No work can be got out of the long-confirmed opium-eater. He can digest nothing but light food, milk,

or soups. On ordinary diet he suffers from diarrhoea, tending to rapidly run to dysentery. His system has very slight heat-making power. He is extremely susceptible to any changes of temperature, and cannot stand cold; he is thus specially liable to chest and bowel disorders. Again and again he may be nursed, by a system of milk diet, gradually on to ordinary food; again and again he recurs to hospital, suffering from diarrhoea, dysentery, or dyspepsia. The emaciation of the opium-eater is characteristic and extreme. Eventually, after having been a source of infinite care, after having caused large expenditure in sick diet, extras, &c, he perishes, usually of a chest or bowel disorder, or perhaps from practical starvation from eventual inability to digest any kind of food, even the lightest and most delicate. On post mortem examination, all the viscera are usually found wasted and anæmic except the liver, which is commonly large, pale, and very fatty."

Q.—Have you anything more to say on that particular point in reference to that view?

A.—There are other passages which I might quote to support my view of the matter.

Q.—Were you present when Dr. Russell gave his evidence here?

A.—I was.

Q.—Did you hear his explanation?

A.—I heard him state that it referred to the opium sot, but the words here are "opium-eater," and four-fifths of the jail population could hardly have been opium sots.

Q.—Is there anything in the context or connection in that book which would lead the ordinary reader to suppose that it alludes to the opium sot?

A.—I think not, because he calls the opium-eater the curse of the Assam jails.

Q.—You have given us several statements and conversations you had on a recent occasion on the way to Orissa and back in reference to the opium habit. Did you hear any evidence of a contradictory character?

A.—I did not. I heard expressions from the Europeans on the Steamer that the revenue difficulty was the great question, and that they they had no sympathy whatever with this agitation against the opium habit.

Q.—You have been combating the doctrine of the connection of malaria and the consumption of opium?

A.—I have.

Q.—Can you give us any information as to when this doctrine first arose?

A.—I cannot exactly state who first started the theory, but it is only within recent years that it has come before the public. I think it was coincident with the agitation against opium.

By Mr. Mowbray:—Q.—With regard to your personal experience in Rampore Beauleah, how long were you there?

A.—I was there sixteen years, excluding two visits to England.

Q —What is the population?

A.—It is a town of 20,000 inhabitants. It is the administrative head-quarters of the district of Rajshaye.

Q.—What would be the population of the surrounding district?

A.—The whole district of Rajshaye has about 1,500,000 souls.

Q.—It is somewhere in the same locality as Moorshedabad?

A.—It is on the opposite side of the river Ganges.

Q.—And since you have been there, you have devoted your attention largely to the subject of opium?

A.—Only within the last four years.

Q.—Then the evidence you have given from personal knowledge is based on four years' experience?

A.—No; my experience and a large medical practice in Rajshaye for sixteen years. My attention was specially directed to the opium question about four years ago.

Q.—You remember Mr. Donald Matheson, chairman of Committees of the Anti-Opium Association, writing to the *Times* a letter in which he referred to some letters he had from you. I think he says "I wrote to Dr. Morison, the excellent medical missionary in charge of the station for the last ten years"; and that is why you say that it was only about four years, ago that you began to make enquiries.

A.—Yes.

Q.—You said also that some control should be exercised over the sale of opium. In what direction could that control be exercised?

A.—It would be for the interests of the community at large that the quantity of opium procurable by one person should be reduced very much; I should say to non-poisonous doses.

Q. —What would you call a non-poisonous dose?

A.—Under four grains.

Q.—What is the present quantity anybody can purchase in Rampore Beauleah ?

A.—I believe it is five tolas.

Q.—Were you not aware that within the last twelve months the quantity can be purchased at any one time by any person has been reduced from five tolas to one tola.

A.—I am not aware of it. I would make it difficult for any one person to obtain opium except for very necessary purposes.

Q.—How would you define very necessary purposes ?

A.—I mean medicinal purposes—opium taken for the alleviation of bodily suffering.

Q.—We have been told by many witnesses that a large number of people take opium, as a domestic remedy for the alleviation of pain. Is that the taking of opium for medicinal purposes ?

A.—It is, and I would not interfere with it. I would simply guard against the abuse of it.

Q.—You are aware also that the quantity taken by the people medicinally in that sense of the word is far larger than two grains ?

A.—Yes, because they become accustomed to it.

Q.—For medical purposes that is a large quantity to be taken as a domestic remedy ?

A.—Yes, it is a large quantity to begin with. I should say half or a quarter of a grain.

Q.—I am speaking of the maximum limit you would impose on the restriction of sale ?

A.—I would guard it in this way, that those eating it at present should not be deprived of it ; and in order that they should receive what they consider necessary for themselves, they should be allowed to have larger quantities. But it should be known by those in charge of the shop that they were habitual consumers of opium, and for those people there should be an exception made certainly.

Q.—Do you think from your practical experience that it would be possible to rest that discretional power in persons selling opium ?

A.—I think it would be quite possible. I see no difficulty ; I think the Government could do it easily.

Q.—In order to apportion the amount of opium which any person is entitled to buy you would have to keep an account of the quantity he

was in the habit of consuming. You would require a very large number of persons for the distribution ?

A.—I think not.

Q.—Would it be possible for a small number of people to know the habits of a great number of people ?

A.—Yes, in a very short time. Certain shops are placed in certain places and the shopmen will soon be able to know who are his regular customers.

Q.—How many shops are there in Rampore Beauleah ?

A.—I think three or four.

Q.—Do you think it would be possible for three or four shopkeepers to know that this man should get one grain and that man two grains, without risk of serious abuse ?

A.—I am not prepared to go into details, but I think in some parts of India a register of opium consumers would be necessary.

Q.—Is it not necessary for those who say generally that sales should be restricted, or that more control should be exercised, to think out the details by which that control would be exercised ?

A.—Generally speaking, undoubtedly one should think out as many of the details as he can, and I have thought of some of these; but I don't think that stage has arrived. Generally, however, I think there would be no difficulty in manipulating the details in Lower Bengal.

Q.—Your view is that the maximum limit for one person should be reduced to a very small quantity ?

A.—I mean for any person not accustomed to take opium, and a discretionary power should be rested on the distributors of opium who should know who are habitual consumers and therefore entitled to have larger doses.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—Speaking from your personal experience you said you had no knowledge of the use of opium in Rajshaye as a prophylactic ?

A.—None whatever.

Q.—You also said it is known as a domestic remedy ?

A.—It is.

Q.—Is it not known in connection with fever of enabling a person to withstand chills or pains caused by chills ?

A.—I have not heard of that, but I have heard it used for rheumatism and other pains. Not in connection with chills.

Q.—You have not heard of the use of opium in connection with fever?

A.—I have not.

Q.—You said, that eating opium is always considered disgraceful. Is it even so considered even among elderly men?

A.—It does not apply to elderly men, because public opinion among Hindoos and Mahommedans admits that elderly people who are failing in health from numerous causes may take opium without being considered to be addicted to a very demoralising habit.

Q.—You also mentioned that the habit of eating opium existed among young men in the Rajshaye district?

A.—I think it is very unusual. I meant that remark rather in regard to smoking. There are three *madak* shops in Rampore Beauleah, I am not aware whether there are any *chandu* shops.

Q.—You stated that in opium-eaters there was a tendency to increase the dose?

A.—That is my deliberate conviction.

Q.—Is it not the case that some persons who begin the habit at an early age use the same dose when they come to old age?

A—I think that when opium is not taken for pains of any kind, the tendency is to keep to the original quantity, but when it is taken to alleviate pain, they have to increase the dose.

Q.—In such cases the quantity taken is not so inordinate as to interfere with health?

A.—I would not say that it does not interfere with health. I believe it does exercise a certain amount of influence on health, but not very marked in some cases. In young men, who are confirmed opium-eaters it does exercise such an influence upon health as to make it noticeable.

Q.—It is a question of quantity to the individual?

A.—In my experience it does usually go to excess ultimately. It usually goes to five or six grains a day.

Q.—I mean excess with regard to each individual's health; they are generally long-lived men?

A.—A man cannot be an opium-eater without suffering in health, be he young or old.

Q.—Do you think it would make any difference in the number of suicides if opium was not easily obtainable?

A.—I think it would.

Q.—You are aware that suicide is common in the country and that there are many other means ordinarily used besides taking opium? For instance, if a man is a cutler by trade, and left his razors knocking about, and his children took them up and cut their throats?

A.—I think that man ought to remove the razors from the reach of his children. Opium has been such a prolific cause of suicide that the Government should remove it from the reach of the people.

Q.—Are you speaking of the Rajshaye district?

A.—I am speaking of India generally. I have heard that it is a prolific cause of suicide in Calcutta as well as in Gya and other opium producing districts.

Q.—In the report on opium of last year in the Lower Provinces it is stated that in the district of Nuddea, 142 women commited suicide and that they did it in every case by hanging; what would you say to that?

A.—I would say that opium was not at hand, or they would probably not have hung themselves.

Q.—I mean that there are always means of putting an end to one's life?

A.—It is my opinion and the opinion of the native public generally that opium should not be so easily obtained for suicidal purposes.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—Mr. Mowbray asked you what was a poisonous dose of opium; what did you say?

A.—Four grains is the usual dose put down in text books as a fatal dose. I have no doubt that there are persons who take a great deal more.

Evidence of Dr. G. R. Ferris.

I am a member of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, and have been in India forty years. From early in the year 1856, I have been in private practice in Calcutta as medical officer connected with the dispensary known as Messrs. R. Scott Thomson and Co. I have, therefore, had nearly thirty-eight years of experience in this country. During the whole of this period I have had daily to attend to the ailments and prescribe for all classes of patients, Europeans, Eurasians, and natives from all the Indian provinces, as Burmese, Bengalees, upcountry men, Punjabis, Afghans, Goorkhas, Sikhs, and indeed men of all castes, races, and religions. This large practice has made me familiar with Indian diseases and the habits and customs of the people and among other things, has drawn my attention to the habit of opium-eating. I

have had no experience of opium-smoking except that many years ago I visited an opium den. In that den I found a mixed lot of men, but they were all orderly, respectful, and in possession of all their faculties. Very early in my practice, I noticed that many patients were opium-eaters. My attention was first called, early in 1854, to this habit when, as Surgeon in the Honourable East India Company's Bengal Marine, I had medical charge of troops and followers being transported between Calcutta and Burma. On a voyage in the Honorable Company's S.S. *Tenasserim*, carrying a large number of Sikhs who exhibited a special immunity from sea-sickness; this appeared, considering the weather, so unusual and so peculiar, that I made enquiries, and to my astonishment I found that these men, who I also noticed took but very small quantities of food, were all opium-eaters. From that time I have never ceased, in the course of my practice, to investigate, so far as my opportunities allowed, the opium habit and the effect of opium on those who use it.

Before going further, I may say I have never known Turkey opium to be used by an opium-eater, and I should regard four grains of such opium as a dangerous dose, that is, pure Turkey opium. The opium which I have known to be eaten by my patients is Bengal opium, and as to this class of the drug, I should consider pure opium in eight grains to be dangerons, that is, eight grains in one dose. When the habit is commenced, usually one pice worth of opium is purchased. This is about four grains, and I may mention that this rate of sale has, so far as I know, not varied in all my experience. At the beginning, the opium-eater will divide his one pice worth in various ways, taking the dose morning and evening; the maximum dose being taken in the evening. After a time he may increase the quantity to six grains, and even eight grains, but I have noticed that a man will continue to take the same quantity daily for a very long time. There are cases where the quantity taken may be as much as twelve, and even sixteen, grains per day, but this I regard as extreme, and connected with some special disease—it may be diabetes—against which the patient is combating. In one case, which has recently been before me, a Native, remarkable for his intelligence and physique, but suffering from diabetes, actually got up to forty-five grains of extract of opium per day. The effect he desired having been produced, he is reducing the quantity. No one would be able to tell from that man's appearance, from his conversation, or his business aptitude, that he was an extreme opium-eater.

It is a common rule with me to ask my Native patients if they take opium, and in this way I have become acquainted with a great many circumstances not ordinarily known to medical men in connection with

the opium habits and with its effect upon diseases. Generally, I may say that it has never made any difference in my treatment, whether the patient took opium or not.

I have not found opium deleterious in the use, or interfere with the exhibition of any other drug. I have not found opium taken as a habit productive of any disease. I have not found it induce emaciation or dulling of the mental faculties, or a withering of the tissues, or of the patient's physical strength. I do not know of an instance of what may be called an opium drunkard from the eating of opium, though there may be opium drunkenness as the result of excessive smoking, especially if the opium be adulterated, but no such case has come under my observation.

My experience of *chandu* and *bhang* is so small that I must refrain from expressing any opinion as to their effects As a rule, the opium habit is not common to young men, but I have to point out that, when, for any cause whatever, young men have taken to opium, they become in a marked and peculiar manner protected, so to speak, against diabetes and dysentery, that is, against two diseases which are, so far as my experience goes, the most fearful scourges and the most feared and dreaded by all Natives of this province, and indeed by all natives of India with whom I have been brought into contact. I have noted that a great deal is due to the food common to the people of India, the Hindoos particularly, whose main food is rich in starch. The Mahommedans, who take more animal food, are not so prone to diabetes as their Hindoo neighbours, but all Natives suffer enormously from the effect of poor food, damp, cold, and the exposure inevitable from their ordinary avocations. It is very remarkable amongst the poorer classes, as proof that opium prevents a waste of tissues—that an opium-eater can do with much less food than a man not given to the habit, and, this being so, it may possibly be that the poverty of the man may maintain the habit at a given minimum as to quantity, say four grains per day.

Besides dysentry, Natives suffer from a variety of intestinal complaints and from the results of malarial poisoning. I have noticed that in such cases the patient invariably seeks relief from opium, and I have also noticed that when opium-eaters are subjected to the same malarial influences as non-opium-eaters in cases where such remedies as quinine and arsenic and other preparations would be useless, the opium-eaters enjoy an immunity which is remarkable when contrasted with the condition of non-opium-eaters in exactly the same circumstances. I have never hesitated in cases coming before me to recommend my patients to continue it,

and I have found that where Natives have come to me suffering atrociously from the effects of alcohol, and I have been able to substitute opium for the alcoholic habit, the patient has recovered his status in society exactly in the same proportion as the substitution of opium for alcohol has been less or more complete. This I consider a very note-worthy fact to the credit of the opium habit. So far as I can judge, crime is very rarely met with amongst opium-eaters. I can never tell an opium-eater by casually looking at him ; his habits and his appearance will not guide me. Of course, I should know if I examined for this particular matter. I find that opium-eaters are healthy men, that their muscular development is good, and that mentally and bodily they contrast favourably with non-opium-eaters. The conclusion I have been obliged to come to is that, in a country like India, having regard to the habits of the people, the character of their avocations, the peculiarities of the climate, and the particular character of their food, opium is distinctly beneficial, that it is not harmful, that it is not a vice, that it does not promote in any way immorality, that it does not increase but distinctly decreases mortality, and that without it the vital returns of many parts of the country would be simply appalling.

My experience is that men, as a rule, with rare exceptions, will resort to either a stimulant or sedative, and as far as Europeans are concerned, the majority use a stimulant ; natives are so consituted that, when they resort to stimulants, they do so to a degree almost incredible to ordinary European experience, and the extreme way in which they indulge renders them, as Native reformers contiuually urge, pests of socicty, and dangerons to themselves and all about them, Opinm, on the other hand, because it is a sedative, absolutely prevents them from becoming obnoxious in any way, I am convinced that the Native will have one or the other, the sedative or the stimulant. If the Government prevents the resort to the sedative, then we must expect to find the wealthier classes giving themselves up to the more refined forms of alcohol produced by Europe ; while the poorer classes will devolop a very wide use of native rum, arrack, and spirits, and the result will be widespead vice, misery, crime, and increased mortality, at the very idea of which I, as a medical man, stand aghast. No doubt distillers here and in Europe would look not to the effects to be produced, but to the profits which such a tremendous demand would yield ; but I doubt if Government can take this view, and as a man who knows something of India and its people, and who has learned to take a strong interest in their welfare, who has at stake the prosperity of the country, deprecate such wholesale degradation as this

would be ; and as I cannot imagine a cheap, a good, and a harmless subsitute for opium, I am as convinced, as any one can be, that it should be let alone, and that it has been not only a necessity, but I would even go to the length of saying, a blessing to the people.

By Lord Brassey :—Q.—I gather from your statement that you are in private practice ?

A.—I have been so for thirty-eight years ; I have been in practice in India for forty years, without leaving the country for one day. I ceased Government employ in March 1856, when I joined my partner in private practice.

Q.—So that your testimony is given as that of as independent practitioner.

A.—Perfectly so.

By Sir William Roberts :—Q—You have given a very full account of your opinion in regard to the opium habit ; have you endeavoured to divide the effects of opium into what is medicinal and what are its other effects ?

A.—No, I have not gone into separating the effects ; I have taken them generally, as the effects of opium upon eaters, because I sometime ago gave it as a hypnotic. I am speaking of the use of it amongst Native eaters.

Q.—How do you explain the effects of toleration; does an eater continue in good health ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it of medical service as an anodyne ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What has been your experience in regard to increased doses?—we have been told that the general tendency has been to increase the dose.

A.—I have known opium-eaters for twenty years, and they now take the same doses. It may be they began taking it as an inducement to further efforts, not for any ailment. This man went from the first dose gradually up to six or eight grains, which I look upon, in the majority of cases, to be the maximum.

Q.—This is the limit to toleration?

A.—They take it with perfect impunity ; if a man goes on with very large doses, he becomes tolerant of larger ones.

Q.—There is a great difference of degree, as regards individuals, in the toleration?

A —Yes.

Q.—Is the habit common among Europeans in Calcutta?

A.—Very rare.

Q.—There is a marked difference between the eating habit amongst Europeans and amongst natives of Calcutta; what is the cause of that?

A.—Europeans, as a rule, are considered wealthy. They have the means, and can afford to buy stimulants—alchohol; natives are so poor that they can not spend more than one pice upon a dose or two of opium. He cannot afford alcohol, so he takes to a sedative.

Q.—The practice is amongst the rich as well as the poor?

A.—I am of opinion that opium was eaten here long before any alcoholic stimulants were known to the natives.

Q.—How do *Marwaris* become opium-eaters?

A.—They take to opium, but they are a peculiarly satisfied, docile, harmless race of men.

Q.—I want to know about the fact that Europeans don't, except in rare cases, become eaters, and here in India the people very frequently become so; what is the reason?

A.—Europeans have some means at their disposal; if he has any ailment he will consult a European doctor who does not make an opium-eater of him. Very few Natives can afford to get a prescription, and his *kobiraj* friends recommend opium.

Q.—There is a difference of toleration, dependent upon race or climate or food, between the Europeans on the one hand and natives on the other?

A.—No; I have seen greater excess, where it has been rarely taken by Europeans. The maximum I have seen has been taken by Europeans.

Q.—To the injury of health?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—You merely consider it from a speculative point of view?

A.—I have not seen any injury to health from opium.

Q.—Have you had experience amongst poor Natives, or rather the better class?

A.—Any member of the Commission would be astonished, if unknown to me, he sat down and saw the classes of people for whom I prescribe daily. The very poorest, the middle classes, and the richest I see every day. I sit down for six or seven hours daily, receiving people. Persons are treated as they come in in their turn. You would be aston-

ished at the multifarious classes of people, Bengalees, from the highest *Kulin* to the *Mehtur*, Afghans, up-country men, Sikhs, poor unfortunate women, who sell their last piece of jewellery to come—all these I treat. This happens day after day, month after month, year after year.

Q.—From your experience you don't know any mischief to health produced by opium?

A.—I do not.

By Mr. Pease :—Q.—You state, "I am unable to tell an opium-eater from casually looking at him, but I can do so by examining him ;" in what way do you examine him?

A.—If you examine him, you will find the iris dilated, which makes the pupils contract. This shows a *bhang* or opium-eater. I have travelled outside Calcutta in the country districts, Dacca and Syhlet, and saw the people there. I have had people constantly coming and troubling me, saying that quinine does nothing. I have proved that. I have given arsenic, and it has acted. If it were not for opium, the death-rate without doubt, would be tenfold. For instance, we will say a man earns an anna a day ; he will spend one pice upon opium and three upon food. He neither loses weight, and will come out well. This opinion regarding times of famine is very generally known.

Q.—The consumers would be about two per cent ?

A.—I should think it is far greater amongst my patients, it is certainly not less than thirty per cent., and I cannot say how much more. Yesterday, a gentleman, a wealthy zemindar, came to me, and I asked him whether he took opium, and how much. He said he took a two-anna dose, that is, sixteen grains, daily. This man was fifty-five years of age, and a powerful man. I did not consider it necessary to stop it. This thirty per cent is exclusive of Eurasians and Europeans.

By Mr. Wilson :—Q.—You have used the expression "made people peaceable." I have heard it said it makes people cowardly ?

A.—I have not seen that ; The Sikhs and Rohillas are the most fearless men we have in India.

Q.—Are you a member of the Calcutta Medical Society ?

A.—No ; my time is so fully occupied that I really have no time.

Q.—In reference to your dispensary, Messrs. Scott Thomson and Co., you admit all classes ?

A.—I make no distinction ; any man can obtain medical advice. I receive no fees from rich or poor.

Q.—Are medicines also supplied ?

A.—No ; my prescriptions are made up in the dispensary.

Q.—Speaking generally, are you in favour of increasing the facilities for getting opium ?

A.—I think the supply and demand, after this Commission, will be greatly increased.

Q.—Would you do anything to further the increased consumption ?

A.—No, I think people would take it themselves.

Q.—We had a witness yesterday who wanted further facilities ?

A.—My view is that it is so beneficial that I would prefer an increased consumption to a decrease.

Q.—Are you in favour of increased facilities for consumption ?

A.—I am.

Q.—I notice in your statement that you find the Sikhs have a special immunity from disease?

A.—Yes, I bring that forward as the starting point of my enquiries which induced me to continue.

Q.—Do you occasionally recommend alcohol ?

A.—In certain cases, of course. To a healthy man I would not say he must take it. I prescribe it medicinally.

Q.—Do you prescribe alcohol for daily dietetic use ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Would you do the same as regards opium ?

A.—In disease only.

Q.—Do you prescribe it in the same way as alcohol,—daily dietetic use ?

A.—No.

Q.—You would not look at opium as of the same dietetic value as alcohol ?

A.—No.

Q.—So far as the people of this country are concerned, you would say the same ?

A.—No.

Q.—I suppose I may take it, that you think there is a marked difference between the two ?

A.— Europeans and Natives, yes.

Q.—Between alcohol and opium ?

A,—Very marked.

Q.—Suppose you heard a medical man recommending opium for daily dietetic use; would you think he was doing a safe thing or a dangerous thing?

A.—Before answering this question I should wish to know what the medical man had in view before he prescribed it for dietetic use.

Q.—Did you ever hear a medical man prescribe it so?

A.—Simply as an article of diet, no.

Q.—By Sir James Roberts.—Did you ever hear a medical man prescribe tobacco as a dietetic habit?

A.—As a medical man, I have known it used in chest affections.

Q.—And the habit also applies to tobacco?

A.—They are very different, opium and tobacco.

Q.—You were asked whether you ever knew a medical man who advised a man taking opium as a dietetic habit; does that apply to tobacco?

A.—Certainly not.

Evidence of Kobiraj Gunga Prosad Sen Gupta:

1. Opium is considered to be a beneficial medical ingredient, especially for the poor classes of the various districts in this province. It has been generally found to do good in bowel-complaints, asthma, rheumatism, &c., which require a costly treatment; but opium alone, when used in such cases, proves a specific remedy for those who can ill-afford to meet the expenses of the generally costly medical treatment. The use of opium also enables persons to give up drinking liquor.

The moderate use of opium increases appetite, power of digestion, energy, and enables persons to adopt a practice of hard working. It also prevents people becoming old before their time, and increases vital power. From time immemorial the native physicians have been using this article with other ingredients in innumerable cases, with great success. Both higher and lower classes, under these circumstances, use opium.

I do not think the use of opium degenerates the moral and physical condition of the people, though excessive use sometimes brings drowsiness, but such cases are rare, and found to exist in the lower classes only.

2. *(a)* Generally no one uses opium unless suffering from such disease, where its effects are marvellous, although some take it to keep up health.

In my opinion no one views it as a hated practice, as the use of other intoxicating things is regarded.

2. *(b)* The expense of using this article is generally met by the consumers themselves. This being a poor country, the prohibition or restriction of the traffic in opium by the introduction of a heavy duty will be keenly felt by the poorer classes of Her Majesty's subjects, and make them starve.

3. As opium is very extensively used in this province, and it is very difficult to give it up when once practised, it is difficult to prohibit the growth of the poppy and manufacture and sale of opium, and it is impossible to do so.

4. No change short of prohibition in the existing arrangements for regulating and restricting the opium traffic in Bengal need be done, but some measures should be adopted to discourage the manufacture and use of *chandu* and *goolee* which are made of opium, and doing injury among the poorer classes to a great extent.

By the President:—Q.—I notice that you recommend that some measures shoud be adopted to prohibit the manufacture and use of *chandu* and *goolee*, which are made of opium, and which are doing injury; can you suggest any practical measures for carrying out these representations?

A.—The habit which people contract by smoking is bad and intolerable. The shops in which they smoke have company which induces smokers to spend more time there; hence these shops ought to be closed. For anybody who has contracted the habit, he should be allowed to smoke in his own house, but not in places where there will be a congregation of opium-smokers.

Q.—You desire to see the abolition of smoking shops?

A.—Yes. [There were three other kobirajes present, who agreed in what the witness said.] All three were in favour of the abolition of licenses for smoking opium and *chandu* upon the premises.

By the Maharajah of Durbhungah:—Q.—Would you object to people clubbing together to form a club to smoke opium?

A.—I object to people smoking together, but when people take opium in their own homes, no law should be passed to restrict them. The rules regarding the sale of opium, now in existence, should not be changed, but should any change be made, I would suggest the change should apply only to public smoking of *madak* and *chandu*, where there are temptations.

Printed by
JOSEPH CULSHAW, for the METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, Calcutta.

Pam.-Drugs
Opium

797

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part IX. 30th November, 1893.

PRICE ONE PENNY, or ONE ANNA, for each part.

Published by the
SOCIETY FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE OPIUM TRADE,
BROADWAY CHAMBERS, LONDON, S. W.
Also at the
METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, 45, DHARAMTALA ST., CALCUTTA.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

OPIUM TRAFFIC

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Evidence of Sudam Chunder Naik.

Examined by Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—To what district do you belong?

A.—Cuttack, South Balasore district.

Q.—How long have you been there?

A.—Twenty-two years.

Q.—You are in Government employ?

A.—Yes, for seventeen or eighteen years.

Q.—You have experience not only of the Cuttack district, but of the Tributary States, also Balasore and Puri?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What do you know about opium-eating amongst these people; first as to the hill tribes?

A.—I have come from Orissa, and I may say that both as a Government officer and as a resident of that province, I possess some knowledge of the nature and habits of the people, not only of Orissa proper, but of its hill tracts known as the Gurjat or the Tributary Mehals. So far as my knowledge extends, I can say that the consumption of opium by the people of my province has had no bad effect on them either morally or physically. On the contrary, I know people taking opium for twenty years or more to have kept very good health. They never use opium for non-medical purposes. At least I have no knowledge of this, though opium-smoking is resorted to by some for pleasure or for other purposes, an excessive indulgence of which leads to some mischief. But such cases are few and far between.

Q.—Is the habit common among the people?

A.—I cannot say it is common.

Q.—What opinion can you give, say about what?

A.—The percentage is five to ten per cent.

Q.—Amongst the Hill population?

A.—About five to ten per cent.

Q.—At what age do people take to this habit?

A.—They take to it at forty, there are some also who take it at twenty.

Q.—Can you tell us the amount people generally eat ?

A.—I know people taking more than two grains daily on the average, there are others who take it in excess.

Q.—In the morning or in the evening ?

A.—Both morning and evening.

Q.—They take it during the day also ?

A.—As a rule in the morning and evening.

Q.—Is there any tendency to increase the dose ?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you consider that it has any bad effect upon their health and morals ?

A.—No.

Q.—You have some remarks upon the classes of people called the Pans—what would you say about them ?

A.—Of a class of people called Pans, known as the criminal class in some of the hill states, I can say that seldom a Pan takes opium, and I never saw one who committed any crime, the cause of which could be attributed to his habit of opium-eating, I may here state that opium has, on the other hand, a very deterrent effect on crime. Of all people, opium-eaters and opium-smokers have a terrible dread of jail, which deprives them of the free and timely use of the drug, and it is an intoxication which brooks no delay.

Q.—Do all these tribes eat opium ?

A.—Very few.

Q.—Do they indulge in country liquor ?

A.—They do.

Q.—For what reason do the people take to opium ?

A.—For medicinal purposes, for bowel complaints, for fever, and for the disease known as elephantiasis and sympathetic fever, which it brings on, and for dysentery.

Q.—Is elephantiasis common ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How is the habit regarded in Cuttack and the Mehali—disgraceful ?

A.—It is not disgracefully regarded.

Q.—In what light do people look upon it ?

A.—They are in a manner indifferent. They don't think ill of one who takes opium, nor is it a disgrace—unless a man here and there is known to have taken it to excess.

Q.—Does the habit extend to women as well as men ?

A.—Women form the exception, very rare.

Q.—What would be the general feeling there as to the prohibition of opium?

A.—With every deference to the Commission, I should say that it will not only be highly impolitic, but extremely unwise to introduce any prohibitive measure for the suppression of consumption either entirely or to a limited extent. People of my country are not and will not be prepared to bear in whole or in part the loss of revenue that would inevitably be the result of such a measure giving thereby rise to wide-spread discontent.

Q.—Have you any remarks upon the licensing system ?

A.—The existing system I consider in no way bad, because the Government has already devised good measures for licensing the sale of opium.

Q.—Can you tell us anything about opium-smoking ?

A.—It is not common, but there are people who do smoke it.

Q.—What do they smoke ?

A.—Only opium, it is called *gooli*, and *madak*. *Chandu* is not common in my part.

Q.—Have you anything else to say ?

A.—I ask permission to say this :—I heard it yesterday stated by Dr. Morison that Cuttack was not a malarious district. He, I think, meant the town proper, as I would say the district was malarious. Cuttack is not malarious within a radius of seven or eight miles, but the greater part, not the whole tract, is malarious. The western part of the district is regarded as malarious.

By Mr. Mowbray :—Q.—You say that the people in Orissa use opium for non-medical purposes ; will you explain what you mean by non-medical purposes ?

A.—I mean that after a certain age, people of my country take it for the sake of their health. For medical purposes I mean for complaints, such as bowel complaints, fever, rheumatism, dysentery, or something of that sort.

Q.—About what number of European medical men are there in Orissa ?

A.—The number will not be very large, not more than half a dozen.

Q.—Can you tell how many opium shops there are in Orissa ?

A.—I cannot exactly say that.

Q.—What is the price of opium in Orissa now ?

A.—The Government upset price is Rs. 32 per seer, and it is sold at from ten to twelve tolas, which is equal to 180 grains for a rupee.

Q.—Do you think if the number of shops were further reduced, that the people would be able to get opium if they wanted it for medicinal purposes ?

A.—No, I do not think so, because the Government provides shops according to the number of people for local wants and increases or diminishes them accordingly.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—What are your duties as Assistant Superintendent ?

A.—I assist the Superintendent of the Mehals in all executive work and correspondence work. I am a Deputy Magistrate and try criminal cases and boundary disputes, and I have to assist the Sessions Judge.

Q.—Are you aware whether anyone has objected to or challenged the use of opium for medical purposes ?

A.—No.

Q.—The question we are discussing is chiefly the dietetic use ; you said that smoking is not respectable ; do they respect people who smoke ?

A.—Smoking is not considered respectable.

Q.—What is the general opinion in respect to smoking *chandu ?*

A.—*Chandu* smoking is not prevalent.

Q.—In reference to smoking *gooli ?*

A.—The opinion is not good.

Q.—Do they approve of opium-eating ?

A.—I don't think they approve of it, but they are indifferent. If anybody takes to opium, they don't think ill of him.

Q.—Which parts of the district are most malarious ?

A.—The Western parts and Eastern parts of the Cuttack District? the North-Eastern part of the Balasore District, and certain parts of the Puri District.

Q.—What is the consumption of opium in these different districts ?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—In which district is the sale of opium the largest?

A.—The Balasore district ; and in Puri and the Tributary Mehals, less.

Q.—Is there any relation between the consumption of opium and the prevalence of malaria ?

A.—I think there is, because the population being less, opium is consumed more largely.

Q.—Do European Medical officers recommend people to take opium regularly ?

A.—I am not aware.

Q.—Do the Natives ?

A.—Yes, they do.

Q.—Do Native doctors recommend it to prevent attacks of fever ?

A.—Not only fever but also other diseases.

Q.—I want to know, not whether they give it as a remedy, but do they recommend it to be taken regularly ?

A.—Yes, they do.

Q.—Who are the Pans?

A.—They are a tribe, and they also form a caste. They are a criminal tribe.

Q.—In what respect are they especially criminal?

A.—They are robbers and thieves.

Q.—May I take it that the population of the district take it for medical purposes ?

A.—Yes, but others take it for pleasure. A large proportion take it for medical purposes.

By Lord Brassey.—Q.—You refer to cases of excess, are they numerous ?

A.—No ; they are few and far between.

Evidence of Gauri Sankar Roy.

Examined by Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—Are you a resident of Cuttack and have you lived there all your life?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you connected with the Government ?

A.—I was formerly a translator in the Judge's Court, but I am now on pension.

Q.—Has your experience been entirely in the Cuttack District?

A.—Entirely.

Q.—What do you know of the opium habit; is it common in that district?

A.—Opium is largely consumed in the District of Cuttack, of which I am an inhabitant, but I have not noticed any marked ill-effect on the physical or moral condition of those who use it. The generality of opium-eaters take it moderately, and they not only keep good health and enjoy long life, but are as sober and well-behaved as those who do not take it. I have seen some of my friends restored to good health after long suffering by taking opium. There is no doubt some persons abuse it by indulging in excessive smoking for pleasure or immoral purposes, and suffer in consequence in health and reputation. I have seen some persons give up drink by taking opium.

Q.—What quantity is taken?

A.—Those who use it moderately, take about half a pice or one pice worth daily, but most of the people take less than one pice.

Q.—When do they take it?

A.—In the morning, some twice.

Q.—What is the general practice?

A.—Some in the evenings and some both in the morning and evening.

Q.—At what age is the habit generally acquired?

A.—Some take it after twenty, and many after thirty-five and forty.

Q.—Have you any knowledge of women using opium?

A.—Very few.

Q.—These would be amongst the cultivating classes?

A.—Not the cultivating classes, only artisans.

Q.—I am speaking of women now?

A.—The women of the town only.

Q.—Are cases of taking in excess common?

A.—It is difficult to make out an excessive opium-eater. I know some persons who take two annas' worth daily; they take it to excess.

Q.—Does it do them harm?

A.—I have never seen opium-eaters suffer in health.

Q.—How is this habit generally regarded?

A.—Opium-eating is generally excused. People don't think much of it. Taking an intoxicant is regarded as bad, but they tolerate opium.

Q.—Is there any tendency to increase the dose?

A.—In very exceptional cases.

Q.—For what purpose do they take it?

A.—Mostly for the sake of health. The prevalent opinion is that opium-eating conduces to good health. After forty years, if a man takes to opium he keeps good health. I have seen some persons suffering from sickness, who have tried all sorts of medicines and not get well, take to opium and get right again, and continue so for ten years.

Q.—Is it used amongst the people as a domestic remedy?

A.—Yes; both for use and as an external application.

Q.—For what class of disease do they use it?

A.—Bowel complaints and a fever called *baghdal*, and elephantiasis. This is a very common disease.

Q.—Is there any belief amongst the people that it protects them from fever?

A.—It is a very common belief.

Q.—Have you anything further to say?

A.—At one time, there was much tendency to use opium for non-medical purposes. It is not so now; and I attribute this to the beneficial measures taken by Government to check its consumption, especially the prohibition of smoking in licesed shops. No more prohibitory measures are called for.

Q.—What do you mean by the abuse of opium for non-medical purposes?

A.—For luxury.

Q.—Is it used as a stimulant?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Amongst the poorer classes or wealthier classes?

A.—Amongst the better off as well as the artisan classes. After finishing their day's work, they come to the shops and smoke.

Q.—Are you referring to smoking, or only eating?

A.—To both.

Q.—You say it is used as a luxury or indulgence?

A.—I am referring to that.

Q.—If opium was prohibited in Cuttack, do you think people could get it for a domestic remedy ?

A.—If it were prohibited how could they?

Q.—If it was prohibited except for medical purposes, would there be any difficulty in getting it ?

A.—If they could get it for medical purposes nobody would mind prohibition.

Q.—If it were prohibited except for medical use, how would the people in the villages get it ?

A.—I do not know.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson :—I don't understand your opinion about smoking. You say that you would like to see further restrictive measures ?

A.—I mean to say that there has been one beneficent measure, the prohibition of opium smoking in licensed shops ; but since that prohibition, people gather in private houses and smoke, and this should be stopped.

Q.—You would like to see more prohibition ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Why then do you say no more prohibition is necessary ?

A.—I meant, as regards the sale in licensed shops.

Q.—You say cultivators don't take much ?

A.—No. I have been in the interior of the district, surrounded by cultivators, and they don't take it much : the artisan class take most.

Q.—Do they live in malarial districts ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Women don't take much opium ?

A.—No.

Q.—Are they less liable to malaria than men ?

A.—Not that I know.

Q.—You say that people would object to the additional burden of taxation, if prohibition was enforced ; who has made this suggestion ?

A.—It is talked about in the place, that opium will be abolished and people will have to pay taxes.

Q.—Would it be possible in the villages of your district to get suitable persons appointed to sell opium, without getting any profit, as a medicine and not as an intoxicant ?

A.—It would be very difficult to get such men.

Q.—It would be impossible ?

A.—How can such a man be found in villages ?

Q.—Do any doctors, either Europeans or natives recommend opium to be taken regularly as a preventive for fever ?

A.—I am not aware of doctors giving it.

Evidence of Bhugwan Chunder Das.

Examined by Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—State who you are and what you know of the opium habit.

A.—I am a resident of Orissa, and am a genuine Uria myself. I also belong to a family of old landholders. I possess, therefore, some knowledge of the people of my country. I am of opium that the consumption of opium has not resulted in any bad effect on the moral or physical condition of my people. They use it for medicine and to avoid other climatic influences, as I know people of Balasore use it. It unfortunately sometimes happens that excessive use of it, not in its raw state, but when converted into some other preparations, such as *madak* or *chundu*, leads to some mischievous results. But from what I know, such cases are proportionately very few.

Q.—What restriction would you suggest ?

A.—The stoppage of the public sale of *madak* and *chundu*.

Q.—How do you compare the effects of the use of opium with alcohol ?

A.—It is not such a deleterious drug as alcohol.

Q.—Do you consider that the use of opium leads to crime ?

A.—Opium eating is not so bad as drinking wine.

Q.—What do you say as to the proposal to prohibit the use of opium for other than medical purposes ?

A.—Opium is always used in my country for medical purposes. I should not recommend its prohibition, and it is certain that its prohibition would lead to difficulties. The people of my country are poor and should not be burdened with further taxes.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson :—Would you prohibit the use of alcohol?

A.—Yes.

Q.—By Mr. Fanshawe :—You have experience of the Balasore district, is there a large consumption of opium there?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There are no large towns in Balasore?

A.—Balasore is not so large a town as Cuttack, and its population is almost entirely cultivators and fishermen.

Q.—The cultivating classes use opium?

A.—Yes, rheumatic pains are prevalent here.

Q.—For what diseases is opium taken ?

A.—Rheumatism, elephantiasis, inflammatory fever, bowel complaints, and dysentery.

Q.—Is elephantiasis very common?

A.—Yes, a quarter of the population suffer from it.

Q.—Rice is the ordinary staple of the country?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Dr. Walsh told us the other day that some forms of rice are bad, that it causes diarrhœa, but poor people are obliged to eat it.

A.—That may be, but I don't know it from my own experience.

Q.—Some parts of the district are healthy, and others not?

A.—The northern part of Balasore is malarious and the other parts are healthy.

Q.—Is opium eating more common in the parts where there is fever or malaria?

A.—Opium is taken generally by those who suffer from rheumatic pains.

Q.—You have no knowledge that it is taken more in the malarious parts than others?

A.—No.

Q.—Is it taken in the mornings or evening?

A.—Some take it both in the mornings and evenings and some in the evenings only. Many take it in the evenings.

Q.—By Sir James Lyall :—Do they take it more in the cold or in the hot weather?

A.—All the year round.

Q.—Is alcohol taken habitually by all classes?

A.—No ; there are no habitual drunkards. Some palm cultivators take alcohol and some opium. Those habituated to alcohol give it up by taking opium.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson :—Can you give us any idea of the proportion of cultivators in the Balasore district who take opium regularly?

A.—Three quarters of the people take it.

Evidence of Dr. Ram Mohun Roy.

Examined by the President.—Q.—What is your position.

A.—I am at present Medical Officer at Sambhunath Pandit's Dispensary, at Bhowanipore, Calcutta, an institution made over to the Corporation of Calcutta since July 1890, and entirely independent of Government aid or control, I was in the service of Government for a good many years, but resigned it in 1890. I have been at Bhowanipore for upwards of fourteen years, where I have, I may say, an extensive practice also.

Q.—What would you say as to the value of opium as a medicine?

A.—The multifarious uses of opium in diverse diseases and complaints, and its usefulness therein, are well-known to those in the medical profession as well as those out of it. It is one of the *three* medicines medical men have learnt to rely upon. If the practice of medicine be restricted to three medicines, and a practitioner called upon to treat two patients with only three medicines and elect them out of the legion in the whole range of the *Materia Medica*, both official and non-official, he would be sure to name quinine, opium, and mercury. Though mercury has, of late, somewhat lost its position, opium has maintained it, and is likely ever to maintain it. From this it will be seen how opium is regarded in the practice of medicine, in the cure or relief of the sufferings to which mankind and brutes are subject. But the subject-matter of this enquiry, I believe, is not so much medicinal use as its use for dietetic purposes. I shall, therefore, confine myself to its effects such as are produced on persons habituated to take it either through sheer necessity or for luxury. As my practice has been almost entirely confined to the better class of people who never or very rarely smoke opium, I have not had much opportunity of observing what effect opium produces when smoked habitually. I have casually met with opium-smokers, but I have never had an opportunity of studying, and, far less, coming to any conclusion, as regards its effects. Besides, opium-smoking is considered to be a stigma, and people who indulge in it would not confess it even if they did it. And then, when smoked in moderation it produces no symptoms, nor any particular appearance on the person using it to make one suspect it. I know some persons, though their numbers are not large, who smoke opium. They are in affluent circumstances, and thus in a position to command a good living. There is nothing in their person which can make one suspect them of the habit. They have not deteriorated in body or mind in the least, though they have been using it for a long time. It is only when a person indulges in it, and has not the means to supply himself with the proper amount of food,

that he deteriorates in body and mind, and one can easily find him out by his appearance. Amongst the better class of people the habit is commenced under a fancied or real belief in its aphrodisiac power, which it certainly possesses, at least for some time.

Q.—What is the result of your observations as regards eating ?

A.—Then as regards eating opium. Here, in India, especially in Bengal, in which the whole of my experience has been gained, after a patient, careful, and sifting enquiry and observation, extending over up wards of twelve years, since 1881, it is taken either in the shape of pills or in a solution of water, but rarely in the shape of alcoholic extract or its active principle, morphia. It is originally commenced to be taken in the shape of pills, once, twice, and sometimes, but very rarely, three times a day. It is only when in any case, after a long use in the shape of pills, it begins to show any of its bad effects, such as insomnia or loss of appetite, that the watery extract is substituted for it. Morphia is always taken on medical advice.

Q.—Have you ever considered the effects of morphia or opium upon yourself ?

A.—Compelled by a sheer necessity for alleviating the most excruciating pains of rheumatism, in 1881, I commenced, under medical advice, to take morphia, the first dose of which was given to me by the doctor himself. I took it in an increasing dose till it reached three grains or a little more every day. I continued the habit for some time, even after I was cured, but gave it up in one day, without feeling any the worse for it. Almost simultaneously sugar was found in my urine, and I was advised to take opium. I was quite unwilling to take it before I was satisfied that it would do me no harm in the end, and I began my enquiry about its effects. I set myself to the work, and the extensive practice I have had offered every opportunity and facility for it. In a short time I got all the necessary information, and being satisfied, I began the habit, and took it up to twenty-four grains a day—*i.e.*, twelve grains morning and evening. The effect was all that could be desired. From the very first day I began to feel new life in me; gloominess and anxiety vanished; appetite returned; dyspepsia disappeared ; the bowels gradually became regular; insomnia gave way to refreshing sleep; the power of fixing attention (which was lost) was restored, and that of endurance developed so much that I was better able to carry on my practice than ever before. I work nineteen hours a day regularly and sleep for five hours only. I would be quite useless and unfit for anything were it not for opium. The enquiry I set myself to in 1881, I have always continu-

ed, and I have failed yet to find a man the worse for it who takes it in moderation. I have since reduced my dose to six grains a day, not for any bad effects produced on me, but because I have found it to have the effects I desire it to have. I had constipation lasting for five or six days in 1889, and I reduced the quantity from twenty-four to six grains. I found it served my purpose, and as a less quantity was found to do as well. I have not resumed the larger. I can give up the thing any day I like, but as it does me good and has never produced any ill-effects, I have kept it up. It gives me much greater power of endurance to go through my arduous work ; it gives me power to resist the effects of exposure to cold and heat better than I ever did before. Under it I can think better, understand things more quickly, talk better, write better, eat well, and sleep well, and I am full of spirit and energy, and can undergo any amount of hardship and fatigue. No one, up to this, although I have been taking opium for over a decade, has been able to make out that I take opium, and there are not many persons even now who know that I do take opium, although I come across quite a multitude of people in the practice of my profession. Had it not been for the paper I read before the Medical Society in 1882, no more than four persons would have known it, *i.e.*, the shopkeeper from whom I buy it, my servant who brings it, my compounder who makes it into pills, and my wife who keeps it for me.

Q.—In what light do the people of Bengal regard the practice of making use of opium, is it regarded as a thing which they are ashamed of from a moral point of view ?

A.—It is never concealed, and it is never considered as a disgrace, otherwise, I, as a medical man, would never give it, and keep it a secret. People of Bengal at least never take opium except when alone. This coupled with the fact that they manifest no external or objectionable symptoms, physical or mental, prevents other people from making out as to who takes opium and who not. He will have to wait long who wants to find out an opium-eater by appearance.

The result of a patient and careful enquiry and observation, extending over a period of twelve years, have led me the following conclusions :—

(1.) That it is a very useful medicine in acute and chronic diarrhœa, dysentery, diabetes, asthma, chronic bronchitis, dyspepsia and gastric colic, rheumatism, diarrhœa stage of cholera, &c., &c., and that in all these diseases people take to it either under medical advice or at the suggestion of friends. It is quite a domestic medicine, and is resorted to by the people from their experience of its usefulness in those diseases.

(2.) That it is really a blessing from *above* in a country where scientific medical aid has not up to date been able to reach even one per cent of its population. It is a blessing conferred by God on the people, and no man should take it away.

(3.) That it really prevents, frequently, relapses of malarious fever. India, especially Bengal, is essentially a malaria-producing country ; its soil saturated with sub-soil moisture, and its atmosphere surcharged with humidity, and its temperature undergoing very great diurnal variation—sometimes a variation of twenty or more degrees from mid-day to mid-night. People who are badly fed and badly clothed, through extreme poverty, having no means to protect themselves against such depressing influences, fall victims to the disease. Opium, though not prophylactic against malaria in the sense that quinine is, acts as a preventive to malarious fever, by giving greater power of endurance and a power to resist the effects of cold and dampness. People by experience having come to know this well-known beneficial effect of opium, use it very largely for the purpose. Since the introduction of railways and artificial irrigation in India, and the consequent increase of sub-soil moisture due to obstruction to the natural drainage of the country, malarious fever and its multifarious diresome sequels have increased to a very considerable extent, and the increased use of opium has kept pace with it. I am an inhabitant of one of the most, if not the most, malaria-stricken districts (Hooghly) of Bengal, and I know how malaria has been playing havoc, and how the remnant of the people have kept body and soul together by opium. To do away with such an agent will be fatal to the country. We are thankful to the people of Britian for their increased sympathy, but we should be more thankful to them if they had directed their energy and sympathy in other quarters than this. Their interference against the use of of opium makes us exclaim, " God, save us from our friends," and " Recall your dogs, we do not want your charity," " Viksha nahin mangta baba, karta bolai lige."

(4.) That people at or above forty years of age use it more largely than those under it with a view to keep them agoing : younger people who use it generally do it under medical advice.

(5.) That it has never been known to do any injury to body or mind if used judiciously and in proper quantities.

(6) That the ill-effects attributed to its use are from its excessive or inordinate use, but even in this its evil effects are nothing compared to the evil effects of even the moderate use of alcoholic liquors.

Q.—By Sir William Roberts :—You say that you reduced the use of opium from twenty-four grains a day to six grains a day, and that this amount served your purpose ; did you try to reduce the amount still further ?

A.—No, I have not tried it. I tried it once ; I went out and was delayed, and not getting it, I felt depressed.

Q.—When you postponed taking your dose you found yourself worse ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You have put in a table which is a remarkable one, and one which in my eyes is, by far, the most valuable contribution which you could give before the Commission. I wish to ask you how you prepared that table and how long you were collecting the facts ?

A.—I know all these cases, and know everything relating to them.

Q.—They were all collected personally ?

A.—I have myself taken down the evidence and facts by seeing the patients. I sent for many of them.

Q.—There were no agents employed ?

A.—All my own. Only one man has died, and him I knew.

Q.—Are they all males ?

A.—Five are females. I have given particulars, and anyone can see them and ascertain the facts.

Q.—There is one man here who is said to be a great age ?

A.—This is a man whom all the people of Bhowanipore know very well. Every one considers him to be a living wonder. I can swear to the accuracy of the statements ; they were all taken by me in my own hand in the presence of people.

Q.—You can put your finger upon these 215 people without any trouble ?

A.—I would have no difficulty.

Q.—You have been addicted to take opium for twelve years ?

A.—I began in 1881.

Q.—Have you noticed whether eaters of long standing have become very thin or emaciated ?

A.—No ; it is only smokers who manifest these symptoms.

Q.—You distinguish between smoking and eating ?

A.—Yes I do.

Q.—Your experience of smoking is not wide ?

A.—No, I only speak of eating.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson :—You have spent a good deal of space in this statement in reference to the much greater harm of alcohol ; are you in favour of the prohibition of alcohol ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are you in favour of placing any further restrictions upon the sale of opium ?

A.—I am satisfied with the present restrictions regarding it.

Q.—Would you place any restrictions upon smoking.

A.—I would place any amount of restriction upon smoking.

Q.—Would you prohibit *chandu* and *madak*.

A.—Of course, if it is possible.

Q.—I notice that out of these 215 cases there are only five labourers.

A.—I have not counted them.

Q.—Most of them are clerks or person in tolerably good condition ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Would it make any difference if the people were ill-fed.

A.—It may lead to emaciation or something like that, but I don't believe in the absolute necessity of milk being given. I remember five or six cases who never took any milk. There is a case here who takes half a tola of opium daily, and he does not drink a drop of milk ; he is in very good condition.

Q.—You take it yourself for medical reasons ?

A.—Yes. I began it for rheumatism.

Q.—You notice that the introduction of railways in India has increased the sub-soil moisture ; explain how that is.

A.—The natural fall is towards the river, and the railway runs along the river-side and prevents the natural fall of water into the river. The water becomes stagnant and it remains there.

Q.—Have you any particular railway in your mind when you speak.

A —Yes, the East Indian Railway in particular.

Q.—I understand you to say that in the construction of this railway there were not a sufficient number of culverts and bridges made to allow of proper drainage.

A.—At the commencement there were not many, but you can't expect the water to go out as usual, as it used to do when the country was vacant.

Q.—Do you think that the railway interferes with the drainage in these cases.

A.—It does throughout.

Q.—By Mr. Mowbray:—You seem to draw a great distinction between taking opium and morphia ; is there any law regulating the sale of morphia ?

A.—Morphia is not sold by common shopkeepers, but only in dispensaries, so all can't get it. People generally don't know what morphia is.

Q.—Is it sold under the druggists' permit.

A.—Yes. I don't think there is any law to restrict its sale by licensed vendors.

Q.—It is as a matter of fact only sold by chemists ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Supposing the sale of opium was restricted to places where morphia is now sold, do you think that there would be a sufficient supply of places to meet the legitimate requirements of prople who desire to obtain opium ?

A.—You mean for medicinal purposes only.

Q.—What do you mean by medicinal purposes ?

A.—Its use in the treatment of actual disease, the actual cure of disease, I call medical use.

Q.—Taking your view of medical use, are you of opinion that if opium were restricted to places where morphia is now sold, it would be sufficient to meet the requirements of the people wanting opium for that purpose ?

A.—If the treatment of all cases were in the hands of European scientific men, it would serve very well ; but the treatment of diseases in common people is not in the hands of European doctors, but they are treated by *hakims*, lay people and grandmothers. You must provide opium in dispensaries for all these cases.

Q.—Strictly for legitimate medical purposes in your sense of the use of that word, the present facilities for obtaining morphia would not be sufficient for obtaining opium ?

A.—No.

Q.—I may take it that for further use, which I may call dietetic use you consider it quite unsuitable ?

A.—It is quite unsuitable.

Q.—Do you consider its dietetic use a legitimate requirement on the part of the people of the country ?

A.—I certainly do.

Q.—By Mr. Haridas : Did you reduce the amount from twenty-four grains to six grains at once ?

A.—At once, in one day, that was the first thing I did, and I used to take it three times a day before.

Q.—You were none the worse ?

A.—I may have felt a slight uneasiness, but it was nothing.

Q.—You were present at the meeting of the Calcutta Medical society when you mentioned these 215 people ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you referred to them in your speech there ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Can you give me any idea how many medical gentlemen were present.

A.—The meeting was tolerably well-attended ; that was my impression.

Q.—Were there twenty, thirty, or forty present ?

A.—Something like twenty.

Evidence of Dr. James R. Wallace.

Examined by the President.—Q.—Kindly state what experience you have had in Calcutta and what position you hold ?

A.—I am a Doctor of Medicine, and my experience concerning the use of opium has been gained during fourteen years of work in Calcutta, both in Government service and as an independent practitioner. I studied medicine in the Calcutta Medical College, and when I obtained my Diplomas as Physician and Surgeon in 1879, I was appointed Resident Surgeon and subsequently Resident Physician to the Medical College Hospital. I also held the appointment of Resident Surgeon to the Eden Hospital for Women and Children. Subsequently I resigned Government service and entered independent practice. During these years I have had numerous opportunities of observing the habits and customs of all classes and sects of the Indian people in regard to the use of opium. My

practice is a large and mixed one, dealing as it does with Europeans, Eurasians, Hindus, Mahommedans, Burmese and Chinese.

Q.—Is there any difference between Europeans and Natives as regards the habit?

A.—I would dismiss Europeans and Eurasians by saying that I have never met an opium user among them. I have found opium used chiefly among Chinese, then Burmans, then Hindus, and least among Mahommedans. On an average among my Indian patients I would say the percentage stood about thus : Chinese, 4, Burmese, 3, Hindus, 2, Mahommedans, 1. I came to know the opium-using propensities of patients casually in the course of my enquiries concerning their diseases. The quantity generally taken was from one to three pice worth, or from one to fifteen grains a day. The majority of such eaters of opium had taken a fixed daily dose for years without increasing it. I found a fair proportion, who had gone on slowly increasing the dose from half a grain of opium till in a year or so they had reached the use of ten to fifteen grains daily. The majority of such opium-eaters had begun the use of the drug under the belief that it gives them strength and acted as an exhilarating stimulant. I have found some who started the habit simply by the example of others.

Q.—What is the effect of opium in the case of moderate eaters ?

A.—In treating such cases medically I have invariably enjoined the stoppage of the drug, as I felt that in most cases the drug itself, or the dose taken, was incompatible with the line of treatment to be adopted. I have invariably found patients addicted to even small doses of the drug complain that they felt badly without it. Three or four days of abstinence from the drug in many cases was sufficient to lull the cravings for it. I have noticed great restlessness, digestive distress, looseness of the bowels, and severe pains about the body and abdomen attend the sudden stopping of the drug. I believe that many Natives who eat opium do so under the advice of friends for its reputed relief in rheumatic pains, some bronchial affections, bowel complaints and diabetes.

Q.—What is the result of your experience as to the effects of opium in the case of malarial fever ?

A.—I have never heard any patient tell me it was taken to prevent or to cure malarial fever. I have never seen or heard of any physician in Calcutta or elsewhere who prescribes the use of opium for the prevention or cure of malarial fever. I have recently read of the good effect of opium in preventing and even curing malarial fever. I have given the theory a fair and honest trial during the past ten or twelve months, and

I am thoroughly convinced that beyond relieving the bodily pains and aches of malarial fever, it in no way prevents or shortens its paroxysms. I firmly believe that the action of opium in malarial disorders, in which there is such a strong tendency to congestion of the liver, spleen and kidneys is not only distinctly contra-indicated, but its administration in many such cases would be undoubtedly harmful. I base this opinion upon my own deliberate experience, as I have frequently found serious complications follow the use of opium when given as a sedative in cases where the liver had undergone inflammatory or degenerative change from any cause. I base this opinion further upon the teaching and practice of many able and experienced Indian physicians, such men as Norman Chevers, David B. Smith, Coates, Harvey, and McConnell, men whose lectures and practice I have attended and seen, and from whom I never heard a word of commendation for the use of opium in malarial fever, men who, as far as my recollection serves me, have always condemned the use of opium in congested conditions of the liver—a condition which sooner or later complicates every case of malarial fever.

Q.—Have you anything further to say in reference to your personal knowledge as to the practice and opinions of other physicians ?

A.—First as a student and then as Resident Physician and as Resident Surgeon to the Medical College Hospital, I had constant opportunities of seeing the practice of such able men as Doctors Chevers, Smith, Coates, Harvey, McConnell, McLeod, Raye, and others, and I never knew one of them to prescribe opium in any form as a prophylactic or as a remedy in malarial fever. I can, however, vividly recall the frequent condemnation of Dr. Norman Chevers while Professor of Medicine, and I know of his recorded opinions against the use of opium, both in his work on *Medical Jurisprudence in India* and his last great work on the *Diseases of India.*

Q.—Speaking of these opinions, you attended the lectures of Dr. Norman Chevers, and speak from personal knowledge ?

A.—Yes. Quoting from the latter book, page 576, Dr. Chevers says of opium-eaters and smokers : "All who have seen much of these unfortunates recognise the fact that in India and China, those habituated to the use of opium, are very liable to fall victims to diarrhœa. * * * Others, especially among the Mussulmans, addicted to the smoking of narcotic drugs, the abuse of which brings on a debilitated state of the system with nervous tremor, and not unfrequently temporary delirium, which sometimes ends in confirmed mania, while in all, sooner or later,

the habit is followed by emaciation, weakness, indigestion, and fatal diarrhœa. * * * Treatment is always unsatisfactory, and but seldom followed by a thorough or permanent restoration to health. * * * Men addicted to narcotics seldom remain longer than a month or two at duty, and are at last very generally lost to the service by death or by being discharged." Quoting also from page 453 :—"A large proportion of the inmates of asylums for Natives are found to be habitual *ganja*-smokers and opium-eaters, and many of these are epileptic."

Q.—Do you draw any distinction between the effects of opium taken in a solid form and opium-smoking?

A.—I have very little personal experience of smoking.

Q.—Have you anything further to say from your personal knowledge as to the effects of opium?

A.—While the moderate use of opium by those in good circumstances, who are able to provide themselves with wholesome nourishing food, may not afford appreciable evidence of any marked harmful result, so long as the drug is regularly taken, I have seen otherwise strong and healthy men rendered almost helpless and unfit for work of any kind and even suffering from diarrhœa and pain when deprived of their accustomed moderate dose of opium. I would assume from this that even in moderation, the use of opium exercises a baneful influence on the human economy. I have also seen many opium sots, men who were absolute physical wrecks from the excessive and continued use of opium. I have seen such specimens in three visits that I have made to opium dens in Calcutta. A report of one of these visits I published in the *Indian Medical Record* for September, 1892, and I tender that report as part of my evidence.

Q.—Have you anything to say in regard to the value of opium as a medicine?

A.—While admitting that opium is one of the most reliable therapeutic agents known to science to assuage pain, to calm nervous irritability in various forms and as a sedative, hypnotic and suporific, it stands unequalled by any other drug in the physician's hands, I cannot help regarding it as inimical to health when taken otherwise than as a medicine. I know from numerous enquiries among Indians that opium-eating is regarded as a *vice;* its users are ashamed to admit the habit, that its continued use causes emaciation, bowel derangement, and general vital impairment, associated with marked moral delinquency. I have also seen and treated many cases of opium poisoning, and in many who have been rescued from suicidal death, I have learnt that opium was chosen as the suicidal agent, because of its pleasantly intoxicating effects robbing the act of suicide of much of its terror. I cannot read daily of the numerous cases of suicidal

and homicidal deaths from opium, without believing that too easy, pleasant, and effective a weapon is placed within the reach of the suicide and the murderer. Having regard to all these circumstances, I am strongly of opinion that the strictest limits and safeguards should be placed upon the sale and use of opium.

Q.—Have you formed any opinion as to the practicability of what has been urged before the Commission in reference to the total prohibition of the use of opium?

A.—I think it would be utterly impossible.

Q.—Do you think it practicable in this country to lay down regulations which would give sufficient facilities for obtaining a supply for medicinal use only limiting the use of opium as a medicine?

A.—I think it is possible.

Q.—Do you compare in your mind the effects of opium and the effects of alcohol?

A.—In my opinion opium can never take the place of alcohol in the way that Western science has taught physicians to use the latter.

Q.—Do you approve of the moderate use of alcohol as an ordinary article of consumption?

A.—Under medical advice.

Q.—But without medical advice you would not say that it would be well for all persons to abstain from the use of alcohol?

A.—Yes.

Q.—By Sir William Roberts.—I do not think your view regarding opium as a true prophylactic differ greatly from the views generally held in the profession?

A.—It is in accordance with the opinion held by practitioners.

Q.—It is generally understood that opium does relieve the incidental symptmos of the malarial condition as an anodyne?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It is said to be more risky, as regards liability to take malarial fever, to go outside of a morning on an empty stomach than with something in it?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Has it not struck you that opium might act as a preventive in the same way?

A.—I think not.

Q.—What is the date of Chevers' work from which you quoted?

A.—It is published by Churchill, dated 1886.

Q.—You refer to the large proportion of lunatics who are *ganja* smokers and opium-eaters ; are you aware that the statistics of returns from asylums contradict that opinion ?

A.—I am aware of it, but these statistics do not make ample provisions for recording the habits of these inmates.

Q.—You deny that those who indulge in narcotics remain long in their employ ; is that a fact ?

A.—I believe it is.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson.—May we take it for granted, that so far as you know, the universal conviction of educated medical men is that for Europeans opium is not to be recommended for dietetic purposes ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—In reference to Natives, what is your answer ?

A.—I would say it was the same in regard to Natives.

Q.—Suppose you substitute the word "stimulant" for the word "dietetic ?"

A.—I can not regard opium as a stimulant in the sense that we generally use the word for alcohol. I don't recommend it as a stimulant.

Q.—You don't believe that medical men recommend people to take it as a prophylactic ?

A.—Orthodox medical men don't so recommend it.

Q.—Is it sometimes used combined with other things ?

A.—Possibly, if the use for it may arise, such as in diarrhœa.

Q.—You spoke of opium as an anodyne, and you draw a distinction between an anodyne and a stimulant ?

A.—There is a very clear distinction.

Q.—You read a report in the *Indian Medical Gazette* of the discussion at the Calcutta Medical Society on the subject, are you a member of the Society ?

A.—I am not.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—Why ?

A.—I was secretary to that society some years ago, but it came to be of a very official character and I resigned.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—You have read the report, and you don't quite agree with the majority who spoke upon that occasion ?

A.—Certainly not.

Q.—Am I right in supposing that these gentlemen represent substantially the opinions of the orthodox medical practitioners in Calcutta ?

A.—I believe it does not.

By Sir W. Roberts.—Q.—Can you give any names ?

A.—Very recently Dr. Lall Madhub Mookerjee, the Principal of a private medical school, called upon me and gave me his deliberate opinion that some on the staff of the institution were wholly against the opinions which were expressed before this Commission. He mentioned the names of the staff, but the information was gratuitous. I forget the names, but I can tell you by referring to the *Medical Directory*.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—What do you mean by " official" character ?

A.—I would say that the society, practically, is connected with the official medical journal, the *Indian Medical Gazette*, and that its reports are made to this *Gazette* ; and it had at the time a large number of officials and less so of general practitioners, therefore I say it is more or less of an official society, the official element predominating.

Q.—This is an important point. We have had many medical witnesses here ; can you clear the point in any way, as to the numbers of orthodox practitioners in Calcutta, and those who belong to the society ?

A.—The Society nnmbers according to its last report, 117 members of it, twenty-five of whom don't reside in Calcutta. There are 780 qualified practitioners in Calcutta, European and Native, practising according to the European system.

By Sir W. Roberts.—Q.—What is the subscription ?

A.—Three rupees per year. All these practitioners are graduates of the Calcutta University, or of some European medical body.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—Do you think that this doctrine about the use of opium in malaria is a comparatively modern doctrine ?

A.—Yes, I first heard it in the discussion at the Society, and since then I gave the theory a trial.

Q.—By Mr. Mowbray.—In regard to the *Indian Medical Gazette*, do I understand that it is official ?

A.—In this sense, that it is supported by the Government.

Q.—What is the *Medical Record* ?

A.—An Indian journal which I started five years ago, entirely supported by the medical profession in India.

Q.—I think you were in Government service yourself ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long ago ?

A.—From 1872 to 1883.

Q.—Did you resign subsequently to or before you resigned as a member of the Calcutta Medical Society?

A.—That was subsequent to resigning the Government service.

Q.—You suggest in your note that opium is often taken on the advice of friends as a relief from pain; is that a medical use?

A.—It is a medical use.

Q.—Therefore, any provision of opium for medical purposes would have to be sufficient to supply persons under those conditions?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—Do you think that, after supplying persons who require it in that way, you would go much further than you have done in restricting the places where it could be got?

A.—I would not like to go into that question, because I don't understand it,—the sale of opium I mean. It seems to me that there is a superabundant supply that should be restricted.

Q.—You must admit that there must be places for the supply of opium, medically. I wish to know how, if you are to have these places open for the sale of opium, you would be convinced they would not be used for other purposes?

A.—It is a very difficult matter to deal with, because friends very often prescribe medicines legitimately. The use of opium for the relief of pain is perfectly legitimate, and it is a want which would have to be met. Owing to the conditions of the country, medical advice is meagre, and people are obliged to resort to relief at their doors. If opium was prescribed under these conditions, I don't know how Government could limit its sale to that kind of use.

Q.—You can not help me in making a distinction which may be drawn between persons requiring opium for such purposes, and persons requiring it for purely vicious purposes?

A.—I don't know how it can be helped, but the less of opium for vicious purposes the better, and this lies in the hands of the Government to prevent.

Q.—We have had it suggested that the person in charge of these places should have a discretionary power, do you think that this is a power which could be safely entrusted to them?

A.—It will be worth nothing if placed in the hands of opium sellers.

Q.—By Mr. Fanshawe—In the course of your experience have you knowledge of lunacy caused by opium?

A.—No.

Q.—You talk of the prevalence of the habit among all classes, what classes do you refer to?

A.—I believe amongst all classes in Calcutta.

Q.—Would you include the Marwaries?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And amongst the Chinese?

A.—Yes. All the people among whom I have practised regard it as a vice.

Q.—If its use was prohibited, is there any tendency among Natives to their taking to alcohol or *ganja*?

A.—There might be.

Q.—By Sir James Lyall.—I understood you to say that you considered that the use of opium as a drug for malaria or a prophylactic, is a new doctrine amongst medical men, but is not it an old doctrine amongst the people of this country?

A.—I have never heard it in my practice.

Q.—You don't think they take opium to protect themselves against cold?

A.—I have never heard that they do so.

Q.—I have met at different times several people in India who have told me that if they knew they would have to sleep out of doors, or get wet, or be subject to any exposure, that, as a protection they take a small pill of opium. Don't you think they are right in doing so?

A.—I would warn all those people to avoid that pill.

Q.—By Mr. Wilson.—I think you have lived most of your time in Calcutta; might not persons, who have no direct interest in the sale of opium, be vested with the discretionary power?

A.—Discretionary power is estimated according to the individuals to whom it is given. It depends upon the individuals placed in charge, but I think if such discretionary power were placed in the hands of a person not interested in the sale you will find it to be a wise measure.

Q.—Don't you think the Government of India would be able to devise some plan?

A.—I believe the Government capable of meeting the evil. The evil would decline as generation after generation arose, and new arrangements could be made to meet the circumstances of the next generation.

Q.—By Sir James Lyall.—In regard to the selection of these people in the villages they would not be very highly paid or educated, and do you think these men could be trusted?

A.—I don't think they could be trusted ; it would be difficult to find people who could be trusted.

Q.—Would they sell the opium at the price named, only accounting to Government for the Government price ?

A.—Knowing as much as I do, I should have a much better system than that.

Q.—I don't see what other system you can have ?

A.—They are sure to be surrounded by all sorts of corruption, and the last state will be worse than the first.

Q —If you put discretionary power into an ordinary Oriental's hand, is not he at once inclined to look and see how much money he can make out of it ?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—This is the great administrative difficulty in India ?

A.—Yes.

Evidence of Mr. K. G. Gupta, Excise Commissioner of Bengal.

Q.—State what your position is in the Civil service, and what are your duties and experience generally.

A.—I have served twenty years, having come out in October, 1873 During this period I have served in several districts of Bengal and Orissa in the usual grades from Assistant Magistrate to District Officer. I was Junior Secretary to the Board of Revenue for four years, and in that capacity had to deal with, among others, the Excise and Opium Departments. I have held my present appointment since March last.

Q.—What are the chief stimulants in use in Bengal ?

A.—The craving for stimulants is satisfied in these provinces from three distinct sources, *viz.*, (1) country liquor (including toddy or the fermented juice of date and palmyra palm); (2) hemp drugs; and (3) opium. The first is preferred in dry districts with pronounced cold and hot seasons, and containing a large non-Mahommedan population, as in Behar and Chota-Nagpore. The use of hemp drugs is largest in wet districts, such as Dacca, Mymensing, and the 24-Purgunnas, or in malarious tracts such as the low alluvial portion of the Bhagulpore Division lying to the north of the Ganges. Leaving aside Calcutta, where the use of all exciseable articles is large, the consumption of opium is

largest along the seaboard from Chittagong to Puri, with the exception of Noakhahli, where the excise revenue from all sources is smallest owing to the presence of a large proportion of Ferazis, a sect of puritanical Mahommedans who are great abstainers. It is likewise considerable in districts containing a large element of Mahommedan town population, as in Hooghly, Burdwan, Murshidabad, and Patna, as well as in notoriously malarious districts like Rungpur, Dinajpur, Malda, and Purnea.

Q.—Have you anything to say in respect of *madak* and *chundu*.

A.—Very little *madak* is consumed in these provinces. Outside Calcutta the use of *madak* is practically confined to the 24-Purgunnas, Midnapur, Hooghly, Murshidabad, Malda, and Cuttack. The majority of the consumers are low Mahommedans and in Malda these belong to the Jola or weaver class. The use of *chundu* is still more limited. In Calcutta the consumers are chiefly Chinese. The only other places where the consumption is at all large are Chittagong and Mymensing. In 1882-83, out of forty-four districts in which the province was then divided, *madak* was used in forty, and there were altogether 433 licenses in force. In 1892-93 it was consumed in thirty-five districts out of a total of forty-six, and the number of licenses was 263. The corresponding figures for *chundu* are eighty-nine licenses in twenty-one districts in 1882-83, and seventy-one licenses in twenty districts in the past year. It can therefore hardly be said, as has been asserted by some of the witnesses, that the use of either drug is on the increase. The figures given above distinctly indicate considerable restriction in the past decade.

Q.—Can you give us any statistics as to the quantities of these articles sold.

A.—I can give you figures for Calcutta separately, they are not compiled for the districts yet. During the past year 355 maunds of crude opium were consumed; during the preceding, 360 maunds 32 seers; and during 1890-91, 335 maunds. Of *madak*, during the past year, twenty-eight maunds; during 1891-92, thirty-three maunds, and during 1890-91, thirty-three maunds. Of *chandu* during the past year thirty-six maunds; in 1891-92, forty-nine maunds; and in 1890-91, forty-nine maunds. A maund is about 80 English pounds.

Q.—Under existing arrangements the system of farming of licenses no longer obtains, but the sale of excise opium in Lower Bengal is conducted by a system of licenses, which are put up to public auction?

A.—It is so.

Q.—Has this system been productive of increase of revenue to Government.

A.—Very much.

Q.—The Government have not found that the system is open to objection on administrative or moral grounds?

A.—The system, I think, is worked very well. From an administrative point of view I see no objection at all, and from the moral point of view I don't think the system is open to any greater objections than any other system which may be devised.

Q.—I observe that the quantity consumed seems to be approximately stationary?

A.—In twenty years the population has increased by eighteen per cent. and the consumption by ten per cent, comparing 1873 with 1892.

Q.—So that per head of the population there is a slight decrease?

A.—Yes.

Q.—By Sir William Roberts:—Is *madak* cheaper than opium.

A.—It is slightly cheaper, because in its preparation it is mixed with guava and other leaves.

Q.—By Mr. Pease:—What is the number of shops licensed for retail sale?

A.—Calcutta, including Howrah, fifty-seven opium shops, thirty *madak* shops, eleven *chandu* shops, of which last only four were opened.

Q.—Can you say whether they are all used.

A.—This number of licenses the man pays for, but for his own convenience, he only keeps open four.

Q.—Why did you grant all the licenses?

A.—He can open the shops if he likes.

Q.—Why don't you withhold the licenses?

A.—We get the license fees.

Q.—Is it not the wish of the Goverment to reduce the number?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And you grant seven licenses for which there is no necessity?

A.—It has been so for some years, and the number has not been reduced.

Q.—Licenses are sold by auction?

A.—Yes.

Q.—What regard is held as to the locality in which the licenses should be used?

A.—The sites are fixed before the licenses are put up for auction. The man who purchases the license must always arrange with the owner of the premises, and if he fails to secure the premises, he must give up the license.

Q.—Men who own the premises have a special advantage ?

A.—Naturally.

Q.—Does he charge increased rent ?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—Do you have any regard to the character of the man who purchases licenses?

A.—He has to produce a police certificate as to character and respectability.

Q.—Apart from the character of the man who holds the whole of the licenses, what guarantee have you as to the character of the person who superintends the particular shops ?

A.—We take a guarantee as regards the person to whom the license is given.

Q.—In regard to the thirty *madak* licenses, they are held by separate individuals?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And they are strictly confined in the same way to the house in which business shall be carried on?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There is a regulation that smoking should not take place in connection with these houses : how far do you interfere where the smoking takes place in a room closely connected with the licensed shop ?

A.—No such case was ever brought to my notice, but if it was, I should direct a prosecution for a breach of the license.

Q.—If I understand you, no effort is made to reduce the consumption of *madak* and *chundu* ?

A.—I am not prepared to say that, as I don't know the actual numbers prior to these figures.

Q.—Can you give us a general description of the distribution of these shops ?

A—They are all over the town.

Q.—Are they more numerous in special localities?

A.—I believe so

Q.—In which locality are they most numerous ?

A.—In those in which there are the greatest number of smokers.

Q.—What is the social position of the people where there is a large number?

A.—That I cannot say.

Q.—Are most of the licenses in the lowest parts of the town ?

A.—I don't know the locality of all the shops.

Q.—Has there been any alteration in the number of opium shops in Calcutta?

A.—The number of opium shops in 1890 was 55 ; in 1891, 59 ; and in the past year, 57.

Q.—Why was the number increased in 1891 ?

A.—I cannot say.

Q.—How many special licenses for manufacture of *madak* and *chandu*, under the new rule mentioned in your statement, have been taken out?

A.—Only one, in the district of Shahabad, none in Calcutta. This rule was introduced in April last.

Q.—Who is responsible for the increase or decrease of licenses for the province of Bengal and Calcutta ?

A.—Eventually the Board of Revenue. Proposals are submitted by district officers to the Excise Commissioner, and these are again considered by the Board, which passes final orders.

Q.—Has a magistrate power to grant additional licences ?

A.—He cannot do so without the sanction of the Excise Commissioner. It is very seldom a new shop is allowed in the middle of the year. In recent years there has been hardly ever an increase in the aggregate number, on the contrary there has been a gradual reduction.

Q.—Who originally fixed the sites ?

A.—It is impossible to say ; most of these shops have been existing for years.

Q.—Suppose a shop becomes no longer valuable, and it is desired to remove it ?

A.—The site can be changed.

Q.—Who decides in Calcutta whether a site is suitable ?

A.—It is decided by the collector and then sent off to the Excise Commissioner ; not merely that, but the Commissioner of Police must also give a certificate.

Q.—He does not interfere with old sites, but he exercises a discretion in reference to new sites ?

A.—Before a settlement is made the list is sent to the Commissioner of Police who may object if he likes, and we are bound to listen. Objections from residents in the neighbourhood are also listened to as well as the probabilities of more crime being committed.

Printed by
Joseph Culshaw, for the Methodist Publishing House, Calcutta.

Pam - Drugs
Opium

79

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part XI. 5th December, 1893.

PRICE ONE PENNY, or ONE ANNA, for each part.

Published by the
Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade,
Broadway Chambers, London, S. W.
Also at the
Methodist Publishing House, 45, Dharamtala St., Calcutta.

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Examination of Mr. A. Finlay, Secretary of the Government of India in the Financial Department.

By Lord Brassey:—Q.—You were kind enough, on behalf of the Government of India, to furnish the Commission with certain papers. These papers were so clear and full that I can hardly suggest any questions to you regarding them. I apprehend that, as regards matters falling more particularly under the control of the local Governments, we shall obtain any further information which we may desire on any particular points in the course of our further enquiries and of the tours which we propose to make. But with regard to the first of the papers you laid before us, a statement of the public revenue and expenditure in British India under all heads of account, I observe a sensible reduction in the estimate for 1893-94, as compared with 1892-93, and also a sensible reduction in the five years 1889-94, as compared with the previous five years; do you draw from such reductions the inference that the opium revenue must be regarded as essentially a precarious revenue?

A.—No, I should not draw such an inference. The reduction in 1893-94, as compared with the previous year, was almost entirely due to the reduction in the amount of Bengal opium to be sold, which was due to their having been bad crops in the previous five years.

Q.—What is your explanation of the fall in the nett revenue from opium in the five years, 1884-89, as compared with the previous five years? The average revenue in the five years 1880-84 was X Rs. 8,624,000, and in the subsequent five years X Rs. 6,907,000?

A.—I notice that in 1883-84-85 the prices realised were very much higher than in the following years, and there might have been variations in the quantity of opium sold. The Malwa exports have also been less in later years, but I could not give a very satisfactory explanation without looking into the details, and observing the various changes which took place from year to year. The quantity to be sold this year is 43,000 chests, whereas formerly it used to be 54,000 chests. It depends entirely on the crops whether that reduction will be maintained. If the crop is good this year, the Government will sell more next year.

By Mr. Wilson :—Q.—With reference to the paper which you produced showing the quantity of opium produced and consumed in India with reference to each of the several Provinces, you have stated that the number of licenses issued in each locality was fixed by the local authority ; are you able to tell us whether the local authorities enquire whether the shops that are licensed are really opened, or whether it is left to the option of the license holder to open his shop or not ?

A.—The probability is that when a license is granted the shop will be opened ; the licensee would certainly not be forced to open the shop.

Q.—A license is issued for the benefit of the revenue and of the license-holder and not with regard to the wants of the public ?

A.—That is not correct. It depends upon the demand in the place, and on the administrative convenience of controlling the sales and the consumption. It depends also on the demand for the drug in the locality.

Q.—Then, with regard to Assam, the quantity of opium issued in 1883-84 was 56,000 seers ; in 1890-91 it was 59,000 seers. Can you give any explanation here that is reconcilable with the statement made by Mr. Luttman-Johnson, Commissioner of the Assam Valley District, in a letter, dated 30th December, 1890, that the suppression of the opium trade in Assam has been one of the cardinal points in our policy ? can you explain how the sales increased by 3,000 seers if that was the fixed policy of the Government ?

A.—I don't see that there is much difference. We cannot control the exact quantity each year. There must be fluctuations from year to year in regard to the quantity of opium issued for consumption.

Q.—Can you tell us how these figures have any bearing on the alleged policy ?

A.—I cannot.

Q.—Then with regard to the N.-W. Provinces and Oudh, will you explain in what way the sales by the treasuries work on the sale of illicit opium ?

A.—I should think it is supplemental to the licensed shops which buy from the treasury.

Q.—If the authorities can issue as many licenses as they think advisable and as will tend to check illicit sales, I do not understand in what way the selling of opium from the treasury acts as a check ?

A.—They may possibly have underestimated the requirements in their desire to restrict the sale.

Q.—When was the cultivation of the poppy in Assam prohibited ?

A.—I am not sure. I have a vague recollection that it was abou the year 1870.

Q.—Can you tell us what compensation, if any, was paid to the cultivators when the cultivation of the poppy was prohibited in Assam ?

A.—I cannot.

By Mr. Mowbray :—Q.—With regard to the apparent falling off of the opium revenue in the estimate for 1893-94, can you tell as whether the price of opium in Calcutta for the China market was affected by the change of the currency?

A.—The Currency Act was passed on the 26th June, 1893 ; at the opium sale of July the price fell very low, lower than it had been for years —I believe to 969 or 970 rupees per chest. In the following month (August) I think it went up to Rs. 1,175 ; in September, October and November, it ranged between 1,075 and 1,100. The average price taken in the Budget Estimate was Rs. 1,250.

Q.—The Budget Estimate is framed on the average of the preceding year ?

A.—It was framed in March last, on what seemed to be probable. If I had framed the estimate now, the receipts from Bengal opium would have been smaller.

Q.—Is the change in the currency likely to have a permanent effect?

A.—I hope the effect is only temporary. There must be a disturbance of trade when any great change takes place, but I hope it will pass away and settle on a new basis.

Q.—In the paper, entitled "Opium produced or consumed in India," at page three, the estimated cost price is calculated. In that statement you will find a column headed "Interest on advances;" will you explain the working out of that column ?

A.—It does not represent any actual payment ; it is merely a calculation of the interest upon money paid before the produce is delivered. We have to take that into account, but no interest is really paid.

Q.—Then, it is merely a matter of bookkeeping, that's all ?

A.—Yes.

By Mr. Fanshawe :—Q.—Reference has been made to a statement of Mr. Luttman-Johnson, Commissioner of the Assam Valley District. No doubt, his statement of the general policy of the Assam Government is correct; but in making that statement, he would not necessarily represent the Government?

A.—Not necessarily, but, no doubt, he would know what the general policy was.

Q.—It is quite possible that the general policy may be what he states, taking the administration of Assam from the beginning and without reference to yearly fluctuations ?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—I see in the statement headed, Arrangements with Native States, there is a reference to a precis by Mr. Crawford in regard to opium ; will you lay that paper before the Commission ?

A.—It has not been published ; but it is available, and can be given if desired.

By the Chairman :—Q.—Will you kindly explain the procedure followed in fixing the number of chests of Bengal opium sold each year and the area of poppy cultivation ?

A.—The produce is brought to the opium agents, and they can tell approximately what its value would be. This is reported to the Board of Revenue, who make their recommendations as to the quantity to be sold ; having regard to the reserve stock in hand, the quantity to be sold is then fixed, at the end of June, for the following calendar year.

Q.—How does that affect the acreage brought under poppy cultivation during the next year ?

A.—When those recommendations are sent up, if there is any reason for an increase or decrease of cultivation, the Board of Revenue and the Government of Bengal will mention it, and the necessary orders will be passed ; but, ordinarily, the arrangements for cultivation will be made on the assumption of what is assumed to be the normal quantity sold every year. That quantity was, till within a few years, 57,000 chests ; now it is 54,000 chests. In 1888 the opium reserve grew very large, and it was specially recommended that the cultivation should be reduced ; that recommendation was accepted by the Government of India, subject to two conditions, that there should be no risk of the quantity to be sold in any one year falling below 57,000 chests, and also that the reduction should be so arranged that it would not be out of the power of the Government to extend it in future years in the event of a bad crop.

By Mr. Wilson :—Q.—With reference to the question of interest on advances, at what rate has it been calculated ?

A.—I should think it is probably four per cent.

Q.—From what date is it calculated ?

A.—From the date the advance is given, no doubt, and until the date of the opium sale in Calcutta, or on which the produce is delivered. I am not sure, but I can find out.

Q.—With reference to the report by Mr. Spence, Her Majesty's Consul in China, are the Consuls in the various ports in China in the habit of making frequent reports on this subject direct to the Government of India?

A.—They send us a copy of the reports made to the Foreign Office in England; that is the general practice.

Q.—Is this a specially important report?

A.—It seems specially important, and the orders of the Government of India are to submit it to the Commission with the other papers.

By the President.—Q.—There is a paper dealing with Bengal opium which you put in. In the first page of that paper you give the total area under cultivation in each of the last ten years. I understand that the area under cultivation has been reduced in certain years. For instance, from 1887-88, when the area under cultivation was 536,000 acres, there is a reduction to 469,864 acres in the next year; would you say that the reduction was the result of the policy to which the late Mr. W. H. Smith committed the Government of India, by his declaration in the House of Commons, when he said that the area under cultivation had been reduced, and that it was the settled policy of the Government to continue that process of reduction?

A.—I cannot add anything to what Sir David Barbour has said on that point.

Q.—Before you leave us I believe you wish to put in a paper dealing with a statement made to us by Mr. Alexander, to the effect that an envoy had been sent, on behalf of the Chinese Government, to negotiate with the Government of India with reference to the traffic in opium. I think Mr. Alexander was not sure as to the date, but he expressed his belief that there had been such a negotiation, and we proposed to ask the Government of India to give us the information. I believe you desire to put in a return which practically explains to us the nature of the mission to which Mr. Alexander referred?

A.—I put in the papers on the subject, namely, a despatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State for India, dated 1st October, 1881, enclosing a report of the interview of Mah Kie Tchong, the Secretary to the Imperial Commission at Pekin, with Major Baring.

Q.—In the third paragraph of Major Baring's memorandum of his conversation with Mah Kie Tchong, it was stated that he had no detailed proposals to make, but he wished to know in a general way whether, in the event of overtures being made by the Chinese Government to Her Majesty's Government on the subject of the opium question, the Government of India would be prepared to consider proposals with reference to the system under which China is now supplied with opium. I understand that the general notion of the proposal was that the Government of India should supply the whole of the opium required by China to the Chinese Government direct; that the latter should engage on their own part to pay a fixed sum for a certain term of years, say 30, 40 or 50 years; and that the amount to be paid should gradually decrease. To that communication Major Baring stated that he was unable to express any definite opinion, without being informed in greater detail of the precise nature of the proposal the Chinese Government desired to make. Then there was a good deal of desultory conversation, and Major Baring proceeded to say that it would be exceedingly undesirable that anything should be done in China which would encourage the growth of the smuggling trade, and that experience had proved in all countries that very high duties were sure to be accompanied by smuggling. Major Baring then went on to say :—"I endeavoured to find out whether the true aim of the Chinese Government was really to suppress the use of opium, or merely to obtain a larger revenue than at present. I could not elicit anything very definite on this point. Mah Kie Tchong explained to me that there were two parties in China,—one of whom was desirous of stopping the growth of the native poppy and deriving as large a revenue as possible from the importation of the foreign drug, whilst the other was in favour of encouraging the use of the native drug, with a view to rendering China independent of Indian opium. The impression, however, he left on my mind was that the Chinese Government attaches very considerable importance to the opium revenue, and are by no means inclined to abandon it. These seem to be the important part, of the communications between Major Baring and the representative of the Chinese Government. Have you any observations to make in that connexion ?

A.—I have not.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—Is it within your knowledge when the negotiations which led to the introduction of an additional article in the treaty of Tientsin were begun ?

A.—They began in the year following the arrival of Mah Kie Tchong—in the beginning of 1882.

Evidence of Hon. A. S. Lethbridge, M. D., C. S. I.

I am General Superintendent of the Thagi and Dacoity Department and a Member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council. In my official career of over twenty-five years in India I have served in the Punjab, Bengal and Burmah, and during the last twenty months have been engaged in putting down organised crime in Hyderabad and in the Native States of Rajpootana and Central India. In addition to this I have been employed on four Commissions, and while on them have visited nearly all the districts of Madras, Bombay, North-West Provinces, and the Central Provinces. I can with some reason claim that my experience of India is at least a wide one. I have not made this subject a special study from a medical point of view, but I have had exceptional opportunities of observing the effects of the opium habit on the Natives of this country. My first appointment in the service was that of Surgeon of a Sikh Regiment, and since then I have been Superintendent of the large Central Jails of Lahore and Bhagulpore, Inspector-General of Prisons in Burmah, Sanitary Commissioner of Bengal, and for fourteen years Inspector-General of Prisons in this Province. In these various appointments I have had opportunities of observing a very large number of persons who were habitual users of opium.

I first came in contact with men who took opium as a regular stimulant when I was Surgeon of the 15th Sikhs (the Loodiana Regiment). The regiment had recently returned from active service in China, and I was at first disposed to think that the men might have contracted the habit in that country. It was not long, however, before I learnt that the Cis-Sutlej Sikhs, from among whom this regiment was exclusively recruited, were, many of them, habitual opium-eaters. On this point I speak from experience gained by a residence in Ferozepore, Rupar, Karnal, and Lahore. In the 15th Sikhs, in 1868, the Native officers and the older soldiers appeared to use the drug more freely than the younger men. A large proportion of the sepoys admitted to hospital brought their little boxes of opium with them. It was never hinted in those days that it was a disgraceful thing for a Sikh to take opium, or that a regiment in which such a large proportion of the Native officers and men were opium-eaters had its efficiency in any way injuriously affected by the use of the drug. On the contrary, this regiment has always held an honoured place in the army of India, and has perhaps been more frequently employed on active service than any other. In cantonments the men were particularly well-behaved, and on active service, in such campaigns as those of Afghanistan and the Soudan, they have distinguished themselves by their courage and endurance.

As an expert in Prison administration, I have seen a vast number of prisoners who have aequired the opium habit. Speaking generally of these men from what I saw of them in their prison life, I would say that their gentleness and good behaviour compared very favourably with the general character of those who had been addicted to alcohol and ganja in excess. It was the rule in the prisons under my control to cut off the supply of opium on the prisoner's first admission to jail. If, in any case, it was found neeessary to continue the drug as a medicine, the prisoner was invariably admitted to hospital, and there treated for the disease from which he was suffering. In unhealthy jails, like Rungpore and Akyab, where the prisoners are reeeived from very malarious tracts of country, and where the habit of opium-eating was general among the free population, it was not found possible to enforce the rule of complete prohibition on admission, and I have frequently been obliged to sanetion the issue of opium to all the opium-eaters admitted to these jails to guard against the grave risks to life caused by depression from imprisonment combined with the deprivation of the stimulant to whieh these malaria-strieken people had been accustomed.

As to the therapeutie uses of opium in the treatment of diseases of malarious origin, I can only say that in my experience the medical officers in charge of jails in the more unhealthy distriets of Bengal have been accustomed to use the various preparations of this drug in very considerable quantities, and I know this to be the case, not only from my personal observations in the jail hospitals which I have inspected, but from the eheeking and passing of the indents for medieines required for the treatment of prisoners in jails.

Where the opium habit is not complicated by disease we have never experienced any difficulty or danger in breaking opium-eaters of this habit by a sudden and complete stopping of the drug. As a rule, a slight tendency to diarrhœa is noticed in these cases, which is easily cheeked by appropriate remedies. In cases where the drug has been used to excess, the deprivation causes a eertain amount of suffering, but this does not usually last more than five or six days.

The use of opium even in excess does not in my experience lead to any organie constitutional changes, sueh as those which result from the abuse of aleohol. Even the emaeiation and tueked-up appearance of the opium drunkard disappears very rapidly after the drug has been stopped.

Beforc I leave the consideration of this question from a prison point of view, I state that it is my deliberate opinion, after an experience of the criminal classes extending over a quarter of a century, that the opium

habit in this country is not, to any appreciable extent, the direct cause of crime, and that its effect in this direction is not to be compared with the recognized evils that result from the abuse of alcohol, both in England and in India.

As President of the Factory Commission in 1890, which was appointed to enquire into the social condition and well-being of Indian operatives, I made a careful enquiry into their mode of life, their work, their complaints and wishes. Many mill hands were examined at considerable length for this purpose, and we saw thousands of operatives working in the mills of Bombay, Ahmedabad, Cawnpore and Calcutta. In no single instance do I remember our attention being drawn by any one to the demoralization of the working classes from the use of opium. It is true we did not make any special enquiry in this direction, but if there had been any deterioration of the working power of the mill hands from this cause, we should most certainly have seen some indication of it in their appearance or power of work, or heard of it from the mill managers and subordinates, if not from the operatives themselves.

During the eighteen years I have been the head of a department with a large staff of subordinates under me, I cannot recall a single instance in which a subordinate was discharged for unfitness due to the excessive use of opium. I need hardly add that in this period hundreds have been discharged for incapacity brought on by the abuse of alcohol.

In my present appointment, which requires me to visit Hyderabad and the Native States of Rajputana and Central India, I have had many opportunities of discussing this question with well-informed Indian gentlemen and Durbar officials. The deliberate conclusion at which I have arrived in this matter is that any attempt to interfere with the rights of Natives States and the privileges of their subjects in regard to the growth, sale, or consumption of opium will result in the gravest complications and in serious danger to the stability of the Empire.

By Sir William Roberts :—Q.—Will you kindly tell us what is the numerical strength of the Indian Medical Service ?

A.—The Indian Medical Service to which I belong numbers between 443 and 450 European Officers. There are a few Indian gentlemen in the Service who have been admitted by competition in a few examinations in England ; they number about twelve or fourteen, I am speaking of the whole of India.

Q.—What are their grades and duties ?

A.—Every officer when he comes to India is obliged to serve as Surgeon in charge of an Indian Regiment. After two years' service he may elect for civil employ as the Civil Surgeon of a district ; but although in civil employ he goes through the usual regimental grades of Captain, Major, Lieutenant-Colonel, Colonel, Surgeon-Major, General. The Civil Medical Officers still retain their military rank and promotion, but they also rise from small stations to larger ones, and the best of them are subsequently drafted to the Presidency towns in charge of hospitals and as Professors in the Medical Colleges.

Q.—What about the Civil Medical Officers in charge of dispensaries ?

A.—They have complete charge of the whole administration of the district. They have charge of all the dispensaries of the district, the number of which vary according to the size of the district. The outlying districts have to be inspected once, twice, or three times a year ; the local dispensary at the headquarters they attend every day. These head quarter districts are many of them large institutions with a large number of beds for in-patients and a very large number of out-patients also attend daily. The majority of these cases are seen by the Assistant Surgeon, but the interesting cases are reserved for the Medical Officer. In the hospital he sees every patient every day, and besides he has a large practice among the Native population, and is called in consultation in serious cases by private practitioners.

Q.—They would come very closely into contact with the Assistant Surgeons of the outlying districts ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—He would also be as a rule the Medical Officer of the Jail ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you consider that in their work they would have opportunities of detecting the effect of the opium habit on the health and physique of the people ?

A.—No European would have such opportunities.

Q.—Could they in any way detect the effect of the opium habit on the characters and morality of the consumers ?

A.—They have opportunities of observing the inner life of the people which very few other officers have ; therefore they have opportunities of forming an opinion on this point.

Q.—With regard to their experience in jails they would be able to detect the connection of opium with crime ?

A.—They are the executive officers as well as the Medical officers of jails, in small jails, especially.

Q.—You have travelled throughout the various provinces of India, have you had much converse with the Indian members of the Service on this habit ?

A.—I have only lately been travelling a good deal, I have had conversation with all the officers I have met, and I have also had general conversations before this on this particular subject.

Q.—What impression have you gathered from these conversations ?

A.—It is curious how unanimous they are as to the fact that opium is not the curse it is supposed to be in this country.

Q.—Have you met with exceptions ?

A.—I don't remember a single officer who held a different view.

Q.—So that this large class of 450 men so far as you know are unanimous on the point ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How is this staff of Medical officers selected ?

A.—They as a rule have had a European education, but there are certain others who were trained in Medical Colleges here and went to England to compete.

Q.—What is the status of that Service ?

A.—The competitive examination for the Indian Medical Service is second to no medical service in the world. It is quite apart from their pass examination. Before you can compete you have to be a recognised medical man. The qualifications of the candidates are always high, because the best men compete for this service. It attracts the best men on account of the pay and pension attached to the service and the position occupied by the officers in this country.

Q.—They are superior to those afforded by the Army or the Navy ?

A.—Yes, certainly.

Q.—The competition is a real one ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Looking to the general status of the men who come to India, would you consider the members of the Service as the representatives of a high class of medical education ?

A.—Yes, that is my belief, and among the best educated men in England, Ireland and Scotland.

Q.—After they are chosen in this way do they under go any additional training in England ?

A.—Yes, they go to Netley for four months ; they go through a course of sanitary science, Military Surgery, and tropical diseases. Then they pass another examination on the subjects taught at Netley and by the results of that examination their position in the service is graded.

Q.—Will you say generally from your experience that they are well-educated men generally as well as specially, and whether they are men of good social status as regards the profession ?

A.—They are well educated gentlemen and occupy a position in India in complete equality with other gentlemen in serving the Government, and therefore they may be said to be of the same class as other gentlemen who form the rest of the services in India.

Q.—So that they would be highly qualified for detecting the effect of the opium habit upon the people.

A.—Certainly, and no persons more qualified exist in India.

Q.—And are they men of such independence of character that their evidence may be taken to be given without favour, fear or affection ?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—Now as the Assistant Surgeons in charge of dispensaries, who are mostly educated in India. What is their professional status ?

A.—They undergo a medical education which in all respects conform to the Medical education required for degrees and diplomas in England. A native of Calcutta by going through a course of lectures in the Medical College here can present himself for examination to most of the Universities, and other examining bodies in Europe. The course of education is as complete as in England. They are well trained men, and a certain proportion of them go to England and take their diplomas there. They don't go through any education at home.

Q.—I presume that their intercourse with the people in the areas in which they serve will be pretty complete ?

A.—Yes, they are of the middle classes of the people and live with them in their villages.

Q.—What is the opinion of that class of men with regard to this matter ?

A.—My acquaintance with that class of officers is not so large as it is with the Europeans, but I think they also will agree that opium is not the curse it is supposed to be ; that it is very largely used by the people in malarial districts and that they themselves prescribe it largely.

Q.—Then they are qualified to give an opinion ?

A.—They have many opportunities of observing even more closely than we, the effects of opium.

Q.—And that they may be depended upon from their independence of character ?

A.—Certainly.

Q.—By Mr. Fanshawe.—Can you tell us the number of Assistant Surgeons ?

A.—No ; there are a certain number in the Government Service and a very large number in private practice.

Q.—By Mr. Mowbray.—Are there many Europeans in independent practice in India ?

A.—In large cities, such as Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, and among the large European communities in Assam, Darjeeling and Tirhoot there are several independent European practitioners, but in the purely native towns there are not many.

Q.—Can you give any idea of what the number of European practitioners would be ?

A.—It is difficult to say.

Q.—By Mr. Fanshawe :—I believe Rungpore is an exceptionally malarial district. May we take that as a well established fact ?

A.—Yes, if anything is well established it is the fact that Rungpore is a malarial district.

Q.—Can you tell us whether the jail population consists principally of accidental criminals ?

A.—Chiefly accidental ; there are very few habitual criminals.

Q.—Then the jail population of Rungpore fairly represents the population of the district ?

A.—Yes.

By Mr. Wilson :—Q.—Can you tell us how much opium Sikh soldiers take ?

A.—I could not tell you what the dose is in each case.

Q.—You said that the Native officers and elderly soldiers are more addicted to the habit than the younger men.

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you mean that they take larger doses or that a larger proportion of them take opium ?

A.—I mean a larger proportion of them. My remark referred to the proportion of men rather than to the quantity taken.

Q.—You referred to the opportunities you had of discussing the question with European gentlemen in Native States. How long have you had such opportunities?

A.—Only recently. Within the last twenty months, since I have been in charge of my present appointment which requires me to travel all over India.

Q.—You adhere to the last portion of your printed statement?

A.—Yes. It is my confirmed belief that the grievance would be so great and such action so unnecessary that it would shake the confidence of the people in our justice and our rule.

Q.—You told Sir William Roberts about the number of medical men in this country. Can you say what proportion of them have been detached from medical work, as in your case?

A.—Very few have been actually detached altogether from Medical work as I am. One or two have been placed in charge of Government Botanical Gardens and one or two in the Mints. I think not more than twelve or fourteen altogether.

Q.—Would that include the Forest Department?

A.—As far as I know we have no officers employed in the Forest Department.

Q.—Can you tell us what is the object or policy of the arrangement described by Sir William Roberts, of so many of the officers of the Medical Service being kept as Army Surgeons and others having Civil practice?

A.—I understand it is due to the fact that the Government of India are extremely anxious to have a reserve of Medical Officers. If a war was declared the whole of the Medical Officers in Civil employ would have to join the Army and take their share in the campaign. The Civil stations would be left in charge of Assistant Surgeons or other efficient medical men.

Q.—Do I understand that all the Medical Officers practising in Calcutta would be required to join the Army?

A.—Yes, and so would I.

Q.—By whom are these gentlemen paid now?

A.—Since the decentralisation of the finances they are paid by the Provincial Government while in civil employ. The Military Department pays for those in medical charge of Native regiments.

Q.—Then the Civil Department really maintains a staff of gentlemen required for military contingencies ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—By Lord Brassey:—You allnded to instances in which opium was used to excess obviously to the detriment of the individual concerned. Yon have not stated whether in your opinion there are cases in which persons make nse of opium daily with direct benefit to their health ?

A.—There are such cases, but not having practised my profession I am not in a position to give an opinion ; but from what I know from prisoners in jail I know that they have not suffered physically.

Q.—Is it your belief that people who are consumers of opium are consumers in moderation ?

A.—Yes, certainly, such a question never protruded itself upon the notice of those who made special enqniries into the social position and well-being of opium eaters. It does not affect the work or position of those who use it moderately.

Q.—Then your view is that the majority of opium eaters are moderate consumers and that in their cases, as far as you had the opportunities of judging, it does neither good nor harm?

A.—That is ny opinion.

Q.—As compared with the use of alcohol in a tropical climate as far as you know the use of opium is less iujurious than the use of alcohol ?

A.—Most certainly.

Q.—Do you see any analogy between the use of opinm by the popnlation of a tropical climate and the use of alcohol by the inhabitants of a climate such as that in England ?

A.—Judging from the fact that large numbers of people in a tropical climate take opinm as a stimulant without any apparent detriment, one would draw an analogy between it here and the nse of alcohol in colder climates. The people take opium here just as people take alcohol in a colder climate.

Evidence of Sir Edward Buck.

By His Highness the Maharajah of Dnrbhunga :—You think that if opinm cultivation was abolished the ryots could substitute any other crops in its place ?

A.—I think this is a question which should be properly enquired into and which requires very carefnl consideration on the spot. All that I say, I would wish to be taken as the basis of inquiry rather than as

positive evidence on the subject. My belief is that opium cultivation is best carried on on certain lands and by certain cultivators. I must explain by saying that the best land, *par excellence*, is land that is fit for market garden crops and cultivated by market gardeners. Now, such lands would be wasted upon such crops as sugar-cane and wheat, and would only be made fit for opium growing and for such crops as I have indicated under the term, "garden crops" namely, herbs, spices, tobacco, and such like. Where the demand for such crops is sufficient to enable a market to be found for them, I think they could be substituted for opium, without any loss upon the cultivators or landlords. But in districts where opium is grown, it is grown upon other lands as well as the land especially suited. A certain amount of outlying land is now used for opium, and is cultivated by classes who did not originally cultivate it. These men are the industrial classes, Kurmis, Ladas and others, and even some other less industrial classes, to a certain extent, have taken it up. Upon these outlying lands, if they are not fit for garden crops, and are cultivated by others than market gardeners, tobacco and market crops could not be substituted, but it would be possible to substitute either wheat, sugar-cane, or potatoes, and crops of that kind. But it is a question which, I think, requires inquiry on the spot, whether these crops, especially sugar-cane and potatoes, do not require a very much larger quantity of coarse manure than opium. For this reason I think most of the crops could not be substituted for opium in what I may call second-class opium lands, lying outside the market crop area. Thus we have opium land divided into two classes: first, the market garden class, cultivated by marked gardeners, *mallies* and others; next, the second class, which requires special manuring cultivated by the farming class. An examination of the question as to the substitution of other crops for opium must be approached from the point of view of each of these classes of land and cultivators. Then, again, I would state another fact, that the manure, both solid and liquid, altogether for opium, is not of the same class entirely as the manure required for potatoes and sugar-cane. For opium, it is necessary to have solid or liquid farm manure containing various chemical ingredients, which I class under the name of nitrates. I have an analysis here of the water which I have taken from a well, the water of which was considered valuable for opium. It contains a large quantity of soda and lime, as well as nitric acid and chlorine. This water is practically wasted upon sugar-cane, which can be successfully cultivated with a coarse form of manure and with canal water, which is obviously free from those ingredients which are required for opium and the other crops I have indicated.

Q.—For second-class land there is really no discovery of any proper substitutes for opium ?

A.—My own view is that they cannot be grown because they require a very much larger amount of manure.

Q.—Consequently, in these cases, the ryots would be entitled to some compensation, not legally, but according to equity ?

A.—That is so ; I think that the loss, which I understand to be about fifty lakhs, representing the advances every year in most of the populated tracts would be a very serious blow to the agricultural population. They receive this money without interest at a time when they want it and if they were deprived of it, they would probably have suddenly to have recourse to the money-lender, to obtain capital at a very much higher interest, and to cultivate under more difficult circumstances.

By Sir William Roberts :—Penang is one of the Straits Settlements ?

A.—It is, and there are tin mines at Tepang and also in Perak.

By Mr. Fanshawe :—Q.—You have referred to the question whether compensation would be necessary to cultivators ; can you say whether the poppy crop is an exhausting crop for the soil ?

A.—I should make the same answer that I did to the Maharajah of Durbhunga, that anything I may say may be taken as the basis of enquiry rather than positive evidence on the subject. My own impression is that it is not an exhausting crop, in the sense in which sugar-cane, potatoes, and other root crops are. It is more like spices grown in a garden. It requires high cultivation, but it does not take much out of the soil to any depth, and I would take this opportunity of noticing, what I did not notice just now, that it is very frequently grown in the same area as a crop of Indian corn. Indian corn precedes opium, and in comparing it with other crops which may be substituted for it, that fact should not be lost sight of. I noticed it was lost sight of in the report of the Opium Commission of 1883. It was lost sight of, or not taken into account at all, any more than that other thing which ought to have been taken into account, viz., the interest which the cultivators have in being able to take these advances. I understand that the Government of those days took into account or into its estimates the loss which they suffered by foregoing interest, but in all the calculations I have seen of the value of the opium crop, that interest was never put in. These two things, the value of the Indian corn crop and interest, ought to be added.

Q.—As compared with other crops, such as sugar-cane or tobacco, how does opium stand ?

A.—In the case of tobacco grown in Bengal, I believe it cannot be grown. In the case of tobacco grown further up-country, it can be grown. That very fact shows how very careful and close investigations must be before any general acceptance can be given to any answers of this kind.

Q.—You are not in a position to give any statistics as to the comparative value of the crops ?

A.—I consider that this question is one of the most difficult to investigate in this country, and that no answer can be given by any one man on his general knowledge. I have any amount of statistics of sorts given me as to the cost of producing this and the cost of producing that, and the profits, but I consider they are only valuable for the particular locality in which they are given, and when you take into consideration the large area over which poppy is grown, what differences of climate, soil, and irrigation there are, it would be very dangerous for me or any one man, relying on general information, to give a reply to the question. It would require very close detailed investigation by a large number of officials to obtain any approximate information as to the real value in cash of any crop, and even then it would be difficult to get a satisfactory answer, because it is very difficult to value the labour of the cultivators and their families. An opium cultivator, a market gardener, employs on his field his wife and all the women of the house, and small children four or five years old even, and it is very difficult to value their labour. Coming to the cultivator of the higher classes, he will not allow his women to enter into his field or to labour. Look at the different profits made by each class.

Q.—From your knowledge of Northern India, would you anticipate any extension of the market for Indian tobacco over any large area ?

A.—This is also a question very difficult to answer. The demand within India itself I cannot conceive as likely to increase to such an extent as to admit very largely tobacco as a substitute for opium. On the other hand, tobacco grown in Tirhoot, Rungpore, and Purnea goes in British Indian steamers to Burmah and the Straits, and I cannot see how far the market might not extend in that direction. It would be a point which would have to be very carefully considered, but it must not be assumed that if you had an area cultivated with opium that the whole of this first-class land could be put at once under tobacco.

Q.—Could not the acreage under poppy be, perhaps, devoted to cereals and cotton ?

A.—Cotton is not grown as a staple crop between Benares and Patna, and it could not, therefore, be substituted for opium in the opium-growing tracts. Further west and north-west, cotton is grown upon land which would not be given up to opium or root crops, as it is grown upon lands of a different quality. Therefore, I do not consider that cotton would come in as a substitute for opium at all.

Q.—Could the acreage given to poppy be given up generally for the production of cereals ?

A.—I don't regard cereals as competitors with opium, except upon second-class lands. I don't think cereals would pay cultivators anything like what opium does.

Q.—Even if the same area were brought under wheat, would that wheat be available for export or consumption in this country ?

A.—I think it would be mainly for export; food-grains of the country would not be grown upon that land, except so far as Indian corn is now grown for local consumption.

Q.—You have told us of advances without interest: do you mean to say that if these advances were not made, the Government would alter the price of opium ?

A.—I can't conceive it would do so: cultivators who now come forward to grow opium get a cash advance, as well as the price which they receive for the opium.

Q.—As regards your water containing nitrates, the quantity is limited ?

A.—It is limited in a very marked way; it is only in wells which are in thickly populated sites or in places which have in former years been populated, that the particular ingredients are found. There are in the opium-growing countries of the N.-W. Provinces and Oudh a very large number of old sites, and it is on these that you find this very valuable water chiefly. Round these wells, as a rule, you will see nothing but tobacco, opium, and other high class garden crops.

Q.—I think you have had several opportunities of studying poppy cultivation from personal observation ?

A.—I was settlement officer in two opium-growing districts, Cawnpore and Furruckabad. In these parts I saw several opium fields growing in every village; except when I spoke of cotton, this remark applies entirely to that part of the N.-W. Provinces.

Q.—From the papers before us, it appears that there are 550,000 cultivators employed in the Benares and Patna agencies : can you from your experience say whether the cultivation is voluntary or not ?

A.—I was seven years settlement officer in the districts I have named, and no case has ever been brought to my notice of cultivators being forced to cutivate against their will. I have known many anxious to cultivate it, and I have known others who, for caste reasons object to cultivate ; but I do not remember that they were ever forced to do so. There is a certain objection amongst some classes to cultivating opium on the score of religion, just as there is an objection to cultivating indigo and root crops. There is a religious objection amongst some classes against the cultivation of indigo and root crops; so there is against opium, and that is the only objection I have come across.

Q.—That objection would not touch the cultivation of opium under compulsion ?

A.—My point is that the only objection I have ever heard is on the score of religious prejudice. I have never heard of compulsion being used.

By Mr. Wilson:—Q.—Where were you seven years Settlement officer?

A.—At Cawnpore and Furruckabad, opium districts in the North Western Provinces.

Q.—How long ago was that ?

A.—Between 1866 and 1873.

Q.—Opium used to be grown in many parts of India where it is now prohibited ?

A.—I know there are certain districts where opium was grown but where it is now restricted.

Q.—In Assam it used to be grown ?

A.—I have no information on the subject.

Q.—In the North-Western Provinces there are considerable tracts ?

A.—There are tracts.

Q.—Can you tell us the general grounds on which the present districts were selected as opium growing districts while it is prohibited in others ?

A.—Because the districts which were selected were very highly supplied with the kind of manure which was required for opium and therefore with the classes of cultivators who are better able to grow opium. Where you find large quantities of these nitrate manures, and where you

find thickly populated tracts, there you will find the market gardener classes, who are *par excellence* opium cultivators. The districts were I believe selected mainly upon these grounds.

Q.—In reference to the water, have you any analysis of the water ?

A.—I sent up some to the Chemical Examiner in Calcutta, and when Dr. Volceker was out here he had some more made.

Q.—Is this analysis before you ?

A.—Yes. I have not put it in, I have merely got the names of some of the constituents of the water, but I can easily put it in.

Q.—Do you think that water of that kind is specially prevalent in the districts where opium is now grown ?

A.—It was prevalent in the districts where I have my actual experience.

Q.—Have you any reason to believe it is more prevalent in those districts than in other parts ?

A.—I think it is prevalent to a great extent in the tracts to which I have drawn attention as being highly populated and whose soil was saturated with the refuse of long past generations.

Q.—You have told us in your last paragraph of the advantages of the advances to the cultivators; can you tell us the grounds upon which they sometimes object ?

A.—The only ground which has come under my notice is that of religious prejudice.

Q.—Is it within your knowledge that there has been difficulty?

A.—The subject has been only raised within the last two or three weeks.

Q.—I have a letter here from the Government of India dated 19th December, 1881, in which it is said that vigorous efforts made by the Benares opium agent to extend cultivation were an utter failure. You are not aware of that ?

A.—No.

Q.—How do you reconcile that with your statement, "poppy growing is an advantage to the cultivators ? "

A.—In the country in which I have had experience there is a great deal of land fit for opium and garden crops ; not only do they take to it readily as their natural profession, but the cultivators around them having an example before them find it easy to copy. In those districts where cultivation is of long standing and of old times, or where the practice has

not existed they would naturally object to growing it as it requires a peculiar amount of special skill.

Q.—This letter which I have read was preceded by a letter from the India Office sent by Lord Hartington on the 16th January.

A.—I was not aware of that.

Q.—I will read you a few lines:—"Some of the cultivators do not now exhibit the same eagerness for the Government advances as formerly." That never came under your notice?

A.—No.

Q.—Will you explain whether the question of higher rents or taxes attaches to the crop or to the particular plot of land?

A.—The higher rent primarily to the land. One of the market gardens would pay perhaps thirty rupees or fifty rupees more than the ordinary cultivators. There is also the character of the manure applied, whether the land would be fit for the crop or not.

Q.—If cultivators who had been in the habit of growing opium, ceased to do so, would any alteration be made in his rent?

A.—I doubt very much whether landlords would reduce rents, and on a great deal of land I don't think they would be bound to do so, I think there is a very material amount of land in which poppy is now grown, upon which, if cultivation was closed, the loss would be so material to the cultivator, that either he could not pay the same rent as before, or he would have to claim under the law to have his rent reduced.

Q.—Under what law?

A.—The Rent Law.

Q.—Can you give us a reference?

A.—I would rather put my opinion as a basis for further enquiry on the point. I cannot give you a decisive answer whether the law courts would or would not hold it as sufficient ground, but I have a strong opinion that the cultivator should have a claim.

Q.—Have there been any such claims where cultivators have been refused the right to grow opium?

A.—No, I have not known claims, but on the other hand, I have to say as a settlement officer I have had to enquire into assessments and have to look to the fact of opium cultivation and cotton for bringing the particular assessment upon the land.

Q.—Are there any other crops besides these?

A.—Maize, a valuable crop. It can be grown in the same year with opium, but there are other crops of less value which can be grown in the same year, Niell for instance.

Q.—Supposing opium was not grown, how many other crops could be grown in the year ?

A.—That depends very much upon what crop was substituted. If tobacco was substituted in the districts I have referred to, Indian corn could be grown before the tobacco. This is not the case with tobacco grown in the lower parts of the opium tracts where tobacco is put in the ground at the same time as opium.

Q.—I have heard it generally said that three crops may be got off the land in the year.

A.—This is only in very exceptional lands, very exceptional.

Q.—Would it be possible on opium land ?

A.—On a very small percentage.

Q.—Will you explain the connection between the two maps you have put in?

A.—One of the great difficulties in this country is to know what to do with the surplus population in these tracts. Special enquiries were made as to what could be done, whether there were other tracts to which they could emigrate. The amount of money, five millions, which goes into their hands every year, enables them to carry on agricultural operations with greater ease and facilities. Without this they either would have to get more capital from money-lenders at a very much higher rate of interest and their circumstances would be very much less prosperous, or they would never be able to get any capital at all. You would thus find it very difficult to grow any grain at all.

Q.—In the cases I mentioned they did not wish to cultivate opium and they do not appreciate the advantages you mention ?

A.—In this instance I can give no answer, because in those districts I have never known objections to cultivate being overruled, except upon the ground of religious prejudice. I have not mentioned the districts, alluded to and have only given evidence in respect to those I mentioned.

Q.—Did you say that cotton was not grown or could not be grown between Benares and Patna ?

A.—There is a very inferior kind grown between Benares and Patna but it is not a staple crop ; and the climate is not conducive to growing it.

Q.—By Mr. Haridas :—Are you aware that the classes who have religious objections to growing opium, grow it occasionally ?

A.—They have come to grow it, both Brahmins and Makurs I shall not say to a large, but to a certain extent, in that part of the country.

Q.—Do they grow the poppy every year or in rotation ?

A.—I believe in rotation except upon the very best land, where it may be grown every year.

Q.—There are two kinds, one grown in the rains, and one by irrigation ?

A.—Not in my experience. I don't know of any poppy grown in the districts except in the season of the cold weather.

Q.—You do not know whether poppy is grown in the rainy season ?

A.—I do not know, not in the districts I have worked in.

Evidence of Maharaja Girija Nath Roy Bahadur.

(1) The opium consuming portion of the population of Bengal is not very large. Opium is taken here—

(1) in lump or with water,

(2) or smoked.

I have not seen people becoming more immoral by taking opium, nor have I seen them suffering physically by using it. Opium taken in moderate doses, particularly after forty years of age, rather benefits than injures the constitution.

Excessive indulgence in opium, like excessive indulgence in other things, is always followed by evil effects.

2. (*a*) It is very difficult to get hold of an opium-eater who will admit that he takes opium for non-medical purposes. In fact ninty-nine per cent of opium-eaters, whom I met, complained to me of having suffered from dysentery, diarrhœa, rheumatism, etc., prior to their taking the drug.

The people of this country do not, as a rule, detest the people who *eat* opium either for medical or non-medical purposes. Opium-smoking, however, is considered somewhat disreputable.

(*b*) The people of this Province are not at all willing to bear in whole or in part the cost of prohibitive measures, as consumption of opium is confined to a very small section of the community and *does not constitute a widespread and serious evil*, for the removal of which the Society is over-anxious.

3. The prohibition of the growth of poppy plants will bring serious losses to the landlords and tenants of the opium-producing portions of the country ; and the prohibition of the sale and manufacture of opium will prove a source of greatest inconvenience to the consumers of the drug and produce serious discontent among them. As, therefore the number of persons interested in the manufacture and sale of opium is not very inconsiderable, discontent among them is not at all desirable. Nor is the absolute prohibition of the sale and manufacture of opium at all possible.

4. The Government has already thrown serious obstacles in the way of easy procurability of the drug by restricting its sale to particular persons, places and time. Any further improvement in the regulation of opium traffic, unattended with increased expenditure would be welcome.

Printed by

Joseph Culshaw, for the Methodist Publishing House, Calcutta.

747

Pam Drugs
Opium

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part XIII. 8th & 9th December, 1893.

PRICE [illegible]a, but the [illegible] or ONE ANNA, for each part.

Published by the
SOCIETY FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE OPIUM TRADE,
BROADWAY CHAMBERS, LONDON, S. W.
Also at the
METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, 45, DHARAMTALA ST., CALCUTTA

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Evidence of Mr. Robert Steel of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness stated that he had been twenty-two years in India as a merchant, during which time, he was four years a member of the Viceroy's Council and sixteen years a Port Commissioner. He had not been concerned in the opium trade with China. As a representative of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce he stated that the commercial community are satisfied that no evils result in India from the consumption of opium. On the financial question they consider that it is impossible for us to do without the opium revenue ; that no substitute can be found for it. They considered that it would be bitterly resented by all classes throughout India if an attempt were made to take away the opium revenue. The Government of India is in severe financial straits already.

The only possible thing that might be done, would be to put on an import duty on piece goods which would not produce more than a third or a fourth of the present revenue from opium, or to double the salt tax. Supposing the export of opium to be prohibited and assuming that the other produce were grain instead of opium, the value of that produce, would not be more than a quarter of the value of the opium which is exported. The balance of trade would thus be affected, to the extent of six millions sterling, and as the power of the Government to maintain the value of the rupee at a higher point than its silver equivalent depends upon the balance of trade, the prohibition of this export would prejudicially affect the value of the rupee. Occasionally small quantities of silver come from China to India, but the trade is comparatively unimportant. China pays for her imports from India of opium and yarns ; she pays in London by the produce of the silk and tea that she sells in London. Through the exchange banks the matter is adjusted in London. Occasionally some adjustment is required by sending bullion one way or the other, but that is comparatively unimportant.

During my twenty-two years in India I have never known a case of anybody being injured by eating or smoking opium. The witness estimated at 200 millions sterling as the sum that would have to be provided by the Home Government to compensate India for the loss of the opium revenue.

By Mr. Wlison. The Cha mber is composed entirely of Natives of Europe, and represent the European commercial community.

The sum of 200 millions includes the capitalization, 1st, of the revenue, then, a sum which will be rcquired to compensate the Native States for the loss of revenue, and finally, possible claims by cultivators for the diminished value of their lands. Altogether not less than six millions sterling per annum would have to be found, represcnting a capital sum of 200 millions.

Q.—You have referred to the possibility of compensating cultivators ; did you ever hear of any cultivator being compensated?

A.—No, I have not heard of any.

In rcply to Mr. Fanshawe, witness said that he had an intimate knowledge of the tax payers of the country, and claimed to represent their views with some authority.

Evidence of Mr. W. H. Cheetham.

By the Chairman.—I have been in India twenty-cight years, and have been intimately connected with the industry of the country, and employ over 6,000 natives. For the first seventeen years I was engaged in the piecegoods trade ; since that time I havc been connected with a firm which has very large industries in cotton spinning, indigo factories, tea factories, steamers, collieries, and shellac works. Witness considered that the Natives of India would object very strongly to increased direct taxation arising out of the loss of the opium revenue. Every possible tax had been considered by the financial advisers of the Government only to be condemned. A cotton tax would probably be the least objectionable. At the rate at which it was last levied, it would produce about a crore and a half. He would object strongly to an increase of the salt tax, except under the direst necessities of the Government. He had beeen informed by a Native doctor that one-third of the population of Bengal, is unable to get salt and that the people burn the stems of plantain trees to get a little saline matter to mix with their food.

About 5% of the working people eat opium. They draw a wide distinction between eating and smoking opium. The latter is generally objected to and he believed the practice to be harmful.

Evidence of Mr. Ferdinand Schiller.

This witness was also a representative of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce and concurred in the views of the two previous witnesses.

Evidence of Mr. Nil Ratan Sircar, M.A., M.D.

By Mr. Wilson :—I am a Fellow of the Calcutta University in the Faculties of Arts and Medicine, and I am Lecturer of Forensic

Medicine in the Calcutta Medical School. I have been in practice as a medical man for the last six years. I was for two years House Surgeon of the Mayo and Chandney Hospitals, where the daily average of out-door attendance exceeds 300. In my opinion, ten per cent in the upper and middle classes, and barely one per cent amongst the lower classes take opium. This, of course, includes cases of opium-smoking. Opium-eating is prevalent more among the upper and middle classes than among the lower classes ; whereas opium-smoking is almost confined to a section of the lower stratum of the middle classes. People belonging to the masses rarely take opium. The cultivator, for instance, the palki-bearer, the fisherman, the day-labourer, etc., who have to lead a life of active muscular work, rarely take opium, though many of them have to pass the greater part of the time in the malarious swamps of Bengal ; nor do their means allow them to pay for their luxury of opium and its accessories. A few members belonging to the lower classes, however, for example, tailors, carpenters, etc, who have more time and little work, join the middle classes in indulging in the luxury of opium-smoking. The habit is generally acquired between the thirtieth and fortieth year, though cases of opium-smoking have been known to commence earlier.

Q.—What are the motives which induce people to take opium ?

A.—In most cases indulgence and luxury. Some take it as an aphrodisiac. I may add that when taken as an aphrodisiac, I have also seen it administered to their wives in many cases.

The habit when once formed can be reliquished but with difficulty. In some cases most dangerous and evil consequences have taken place after relinquishing opium. I know cases of that sort. But ordinarily the habit can be relinquished with some difficulty.

Q.—Is there a marked difference between moderate and excessive consumers ?

A.—That is a question which I could not thoroughly understand ; it was rather vague, and I could not answer the question definitely.

Q.—Do you draw any particular and marked distinction between those who are in the habit of taking opium in small quantities or in moderation and those who take large or excessive quantities ?

A.—In the case of alcohol it is easy to make a distinction, but in the case of opium, it is not easy. Under one ounce of alcohol corresponding to two ounces of brandy, it would be almost harmless ; but in the case of opium it is different.

Q.—What proportion of income does each habitual smoker spend on opium ?

A.—The proportion varies in different classes. It is very trifling with the members of the upper class. It is a pretty good drain upon the income of the members of the middle class ; and it is not less than one-fourth of what a member of the average lower class people earns as his day's wages.

At first a small dose is sufficient to fulfil the desired object, but as the victim become more and more habituated to the drug, he generally not only requires a larger dose, but also at a shorter interval. When habitually taken opium acts primarily as a stimulant chiefly of the brain, but also to some extent of the circulatory system. When taken in small doses (less than one grain for the first few weeks, this stage of excitement lasts for five or six hours and is followed by sound sleep. The after-effects when the primary sleep and excitement have passed away, are nausea, headache, depression and listlessness. As the habit becomes confirmed the excitement diminishes and the miserable after effects become more marked and more prolonged. To combat this depression of spirits, a larger dose is often had recourse to. When the victim sticks to a very small dose and when he can manage to live upon milk and other similar nourishing articles of diet, the evil effects of the habit are not so well marked for a fairly long time, but the process of digestion being slowly impaired, malnutrition is sure to supervene in the long run. As a rule, however, the dose is indefinitely increased in most cases ; the process of general nutrition suffers materially within a short time, the power of resistance to disease generally becomes diminished, and the opium-eater becomes predisposed to some diseases, for example, cold, bronchitis, diarrhœa, dysentery and dyspepsia. The power of repair becomes also slow ; and hence the confirmed habit of opium-eating is looked upon by surgeons as a disadvantage in operation cases. In confirmed opium-eaters comparatively trivial attacks of ordinary diseases such as fever, diarrhœa, bronchitis, cold and specially dysentery, have generally a grave prognosis, almost every medicine fails to produce its re-action on the system. As a rule opium-eaters die of very trivial complaints ; opium has no dietetic value. The exhilaration of mind produced in the first stage of opium intoxication, together with the sense of freedom from anxieties and sufferings of all sorts is the great temptation of opium. In beginners this effect is extremely deluding, and if he sticks to a small dose may last with him for a fairly long period. But with a confirmed opium-eater who often takes to an increased dose gradually, this effect vanishes soon. Sooner or later torpor

of the mind supervenes and the victim becomes dull, apathetic, enfeebled intellect and, in fact, almost demented. The moral nature of the victim is also slowly but steadily affected. He becomes gradually more and more idle, sluggish, shy, and cowardly ; he has no scruples to give false evidence in Court ; he has no scruples to steal other people's property. In many cases the moral sense becomes almost perverted. All these effects are much more pronounced in the opium-smoker than in the opium-eater. I am connected with a Life Insurance Company in this city. Ordinarily we do not pass opium-eaters, but if any candidate takes small quantities we pass him at a higher premium.

Q.—Can you give any opinion as to the proportion of injurious results that follow from opium-eating ?

A.—In three-fourths of the cases in some shape or other.

Q.—What do you say in regard to any popular opinion as to opium being a protection against fever ?

A.—I do not think that the public have the idea that opium is a protection against fever.

Q.—Do you think that it is ?

A.—No, I do not. There is no evidence to prove the supposed prophylactic action of opium against fever.

Q.—Is the use of opium specially useful in malarious districts ?

A.—I do not think it has ever been used as a useful medicine in malarious districts, either as a prophylactic against fever or as an antiperiodic in the course of the fever. It has, however, been tentatively used by Dr. O'Shaughnessy in malarious fever in the intermission stage as an antiperiodic, but as regards this action he himself says : "The antiperiodic virtues of the drug are scarcely procurable from any safe doses." I have been to several of the malarious districts of central and east Bengal, and nowhere have I noticed opium appreciated by the people as a preventive against malarious fever ; on the other hand, I have noticed opium-eaters equally affected with malaria with abstainers.

Q.—Do you consider that opium is needful, or that the people believe it to be needful to enable working people to get through their work ?

A.—Certainly not. In Bengal the working people are much better without opium. The use of opium would make them much more idle, dull, and torpid than they actually are. On the other hand, I have been credibly informed that the lower class people of Assam and certain hill people who take opium are extremely idle and leave the greater part of

their manual work to their wives and daughters who take less opium and are much more active. Compared with opium-smoking the chair-coolies of China, who on the authority of Mr. Cooper could work well as long as they got their daily supply of opium, but "became wretchedly weak and miserable after a single day's absence, and who would be down with water streaming from their eyes, listless, disinclined to eat and unable to sleep;" without opium our working people, malaria striken and ill-fed as they are, are much more advantageously situated, being much more regular, steady, and hardy in their work. I have a very poor idea of the working capacity of the opium-smokers. I speak of Bengal only.

Q.—Do you think that the taking of opium is regarded as disgraceful or discreditable?

A.—Yes. The words *afimkhor* (opium-eater) and *golikhor* (opium-smoker) are terms of reproach.

Q.—Do you think it would be desirable to prohibit the sale of opium except for medical purposes?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think that the public opinion of India would justify anything of that kind?

A.—So far as I can gauge public opinion they will support it.

Q.—If there were any further restriction or prohibition, would it be desirable to make special provision for the wants of those who are already accustomed to the use of opium?

A.—Yes, at least for some time.

Q.—Do you suggest what means could be adopted for doing that?

A.—It may be under a doctor's prescription as other medicines are sold.

Q.—Is it not the case that there are large parts of Bengal in which there are no medical men available?

A.—Yes; there are some places, and in those places I think it may be sold through Post Offices, as quinine is now dealt out to malaria-stricken people by the Government.

The word "opium" does not occur in early Sanskrit words on medicine. The date of Vaba Prakas, the earliest work in which opium is mentioned, has been fixed by Dr. Wise as three hundred years ago. There is a particular disease mentioned in that book which prevailed first amongst the Portuguese and is called Firingi Rog. That is the name under which syphilis is described in Vaba Prakas. That shows that the book must have been compiled after the Portuguese had been in India.

Q.—I dare say you are aware that we have had some Native practitioners here according to the Ayurvedic System who have told us that opium was recommended in some of their books eight hundred years old?

A.—Yes, but I do not think Vaba Prakas the earliest work in which opium is mentioned, is eight hundred years old.

By Mr. Fanshawe. Q.—Your professional experience extends over six years?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Has it been limited to Calcutta?

A.—Not entirely limited to Calcutta. I have made frequent tours in Eastern Bengal and Central Bengal and other places. Calcutta is the principal field of my practice.

Q.—Have you made the opium habit among the people a subject of any special enquiry or study?

A.—Not of special enquiry, but I have frequently come in contact with opium-eaters and I have noticed them and formed my opinion about them.

Q.—In one of your answers you have stated that the cultivators and the fishermen who pass the greater part of their time in the marshy parts of Bengal are not in the habit of taking opium. Where have you acquired your experience of these classes of people?

A.—In several districts. I belong to the 24 Pergunnahs, and am a Native of where cultivators and fishermen never take opium. I have several times been to Eastern Bengal on professional visits in Mymensing and Dacca.

By Mr. Fanshawe. Q.—You have stated that the lower class people spend on an average one-fourth of their wages on opium?

A.—Yes. They take four grains in the morning and four in the evening, costing altogether two pice, which with the additional expenses on account of extra diet represents one-fourth of the average daily wages?

Q.—Do not persons of the middle class eat sweetmeats as a matter of ordinary diet?

A.—Ordinarily they do not take sweetmeats every day. Some of them take it at tiffin. The opium-eater requires more.

Q.—You have stated that the confirmed habit of opium eating is a great disadvantage in operation cases: have you performed operations in the case of opium eaters?

A.—I have not, but I know surgeons who have avoided it, unless it was an operation of emergency.

My own professor, Dr. McLeod, used to say that it was a disadvantage, and he mentions this in his book.

Q.—You are not speaking of your own knowledge ?

A.—From my own knowledge. I would avoid operations on opium eaters.

Evidence of Mr. Herambu Chunder Mittra, M.A.,

By Mr. Wilson. I am Professor of English in the City College, Examiner in English of the Calcutta University.

The City College has about 1,500 students in all departments. I belong to Nuddea, which is a malarious district. I have never seen opium used as a preventive or prophylactic against malaria, nor is it ordinarily used as a domestic medicine. It is only so used in some few cases.

Q.—What do you wish to say about its physical and moral effects ?

A.—As far as I have been able to observe, its physical effects are injurious in the extreme. Want of energy and vigour manifest itself almost in every way. The people are generally able to distinguish opium-eaters or opium-smokers from those who do not use the drug, by their emaciated features, sunken eyes, and their lethargy and indolence. In the case of a very well-to-do man who can afford to take plenty of milk and other nourishing food, the injurious physical effects of the drug are to great extent counteracted ; and I remember one case in which the physical effects of opium-smoking were not perceptible. I cannot account for this exceptional case otherwise than by supposing that the physical constitution of this man was sufficiently strong to resist the effects of the drug. But in the vast majority of cases opium-smoking is disastrous in its results. Opium eating is less injurious than opium-smoking, but, except when used for medical purposes, it is seriously harmful. Very often opium-eaters and opium-smokers die a premature death from dysentery or other diseases. I have known some most painful cases of premature death from the effects of opium. As to the moral results of of the consumption of opium, in most cases all manhood is crushed out of a person addicted to it. The habit is so terrible in its power over its victim, that he is driven to the sacrifice of all considerations of health, respectability, and usefulness for its sake.

Q.—What do you say in reference to public opinion in connection with opium eating ?

A.—That the habit of taking opium is looked upon as disgraceful, is easily proved by certain well-known facts. In the first place, the extreme secrecy with which the habit is indulged in, indicates the strong reluctance of opium-eaters or smokers to allow their habit to be known.

Secondly, the terms *golikhor* (opium-smoker) and *afimkhor* (opium eater) are regarded as most abusive, being taken to cover the meaning of the words "insane," "dishonest," "indolent." They would be resented by any one to whom they might be applied. Thirdly, if any one looks very lean and emaciated, people say of him "he looks like an opium-smoker or opium-eater." I may mention two more facts to show how extremely disgraceful and degrading the habit is considered to be. An aunt of mine was advised to take opium as a medicine in consequence of certain disorders from which she suffered : she said, with a very sad look : "If I must take opium, I shall submit to it as an inevitable affliction." My father suffered from chronic diarrhœa for nearly twenty years before his death. He once said in my presence that he had been advised by many to take opium, but he would never do it even for the sake of life.

Q.—Have you any suggestion to make as to how the loss of revenue might be made up, provided there was a loss and England did not make it up ?

A.—If the traffic can be shown to be injurious and degrading, we must submit to the inevitable loss and must make it up as the Government of India is now bound to make up the loss it has inflicted upon itself by granting an exchange compensation allowance to its European servants. I am not a financial expert, and can only speak of the question from a moral aspect. I further suggest that a curtailment of expenditure might be profitably tried in certain departments of adminstration in order partially to meet the loss. In my opinion the sale of opium ought to be permitted only at dispensaries and on the prescriptions of medical men.

Q.—Is it not the case that there are many parts of Bengal in which there are no medical men to give prescriptions ?

A.—Certainly such is the case, but I would rather have people go without opium than have it placed within their reach, as is the case with other poisons that are not vended except in dispensaries.

Q.—In the cases in which there are no medical men who could give these prescriptions, is there any class of persons in the Bengal villages who you think might be entrusted with a discretionary power to supply it for medical purposes and to refuse it where it was not so required ?

A.—I am certainly aware of various classes of men who practise though they are not qualified. There are some whom I would not entrust with the sale of opium ; on the other hand, there are others who have had some training ; they have not passed the examinations of the Medical College of any Indian University or of the medical schools, but they have studied at these places or seats of learning for several years

and, therefore, have some little knowledge of medical subjects, Such men I would entrust, and also those who have had some little training in the old Hindu method of treating eases, the *Kobirajes*.

I have been invited to give evidence here by the Indian Association which consists solely of Natives of India and by the Brahmo Somaj.

By Mr. Haridas Veharidas.—Would you compare the effects of opium with those of alcohol taken in excess ?

A.—I would rather avoid making any comparison because I regard both as extremely injurious.

Q.—Both are equally bad ?

A.—Yes in different ways. It may be that alcohol stimulates, and opium enfeebles and enervates—that is the only difference. Nature in both cases is ruined, disordered ; in the one case by being pushed beyond its normal limits, and in the other by being enervated and enfeebled.

Q.—You say that the opium habit and the alcohol habits are two evils ; if you were asked, which you would prefer ?

A.—It would be like asking me whether I would prefer to die of cholera or paralysis.

By the Chairman.—You regard the indulgence in alcohol or in opium as a vice ?

A.—Yes.

By Mr. Haridas Veharidas.—Which would you deal with first ?

A.—From a financial point of view I do not know that I can make any suggestion of any value ; but I might suggest that a further restriction of eonsumption might be practised in both fields.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Do you think that the alcohol habit is doing more harm than opium or less harm ?

A.—I confess it is rather difficult to make any comparison. I have known people who have been ruined by indulgence in alcohol, and I have known people who have been ruined by indulgence in opium.

Q.—You are not prepared to express any opinion as to the comparative harm whieh from your point of view they are doing.

A.—It would be difficult for this reason, that the proportion of those who indulge in aleohol or opium varies considerably at various places. If I saw in certain villages that opium was doing a great deal of harm I should be inclined to do away with it, and if in another place I saw alcohol was doing harm I should be inclined to do away with that.

Q.—Do your remarks apply more particularly to the eating of opium in excess or also to the eating in moderation?

A.—I find it very difficult to make a distinction between eating in excess and moderate eating though I can make a distinction between those who eat opium for medicinal purposes, and those who use it merely for the pleasure they derive from the narcotic effects of the drug.

There are cases where the use of it has begun only from the motive of preserving health, and that is not regarded as equally disgraceful with those cases in which it is used merely for its narcotic effects. A sufferer from certain complaints might be advised by his doctor to take opium for a day or two, and that would not be regarded as disgraceful, but if, even from motives of health, he took to the use of opium daily his feeling would be that he would not be quite understood, that his conduct might be misinterpreted.

Q.—Does the word "*Afim-khor*" mean an opium-eater in excess or in moderation?

A.—I do not know the quantity of opium which must be taken daily to justify the word "*afim-khor*." It would not be used as a term of reproach to those who took opium only for medical purposes.

Q.—Do you mean those who use it habitually for medical purposes?

A.—If habitually used, all I can say is that it would be unjust to them, but people would apply it even to them.

Q.—Is the opium habit fairly common in the Nuddea District?

A.—In one sense it is not common; only a small proportion of the population take it. The proportion of opium eaters or smokers varies considerably in different localities. In some places fifty per cent of the people take it. In a place near my own native village fifty per cent of the people at least are consumers of opium, but in my own native village I have not seen a single person using opium.

Q.—Can you give any reason for that?

A.—The only reason I can think of is that the habit is contagious, and that it spreads in those places where there have been opium smokers for a long time.

Evidence of Mr. H. M. Rustomjee of the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Rustomjee in reply to the Chairman said that he was one of the Vice-Presidents of the Chamber and had been an Honorary Presidency Magistrate for more than sixteen years. He did not remember ever having a serious case of a criminal addicted to opium-eating. He considered that the majority of opium-eaters were consumers in moderate

amounts, and that to them the use of opium was beneficial and harmless. The people of India were very heavily taxed already, and if fresh taxation were imposed in consequence of the suppression of the opium revenue, it would create great discontent and dissatisfaction. If the use of opium were prohibited, he thought it would lead to the increased consumption of alcohol, which would demoralize the people. He did not think it could be done by reduction of the Civil or Military expenditure, as reducing salaries would bring an inferior class of men into the Government Service.

Evidence of Mr. Nil Comul Mookerjee.

Mr. Mookerjee, a Port Commissioner, concurred in these views. He had had the management of the Tagore States in Rajshai, Mymensing, Pubna and Krishnagur, and in these districts he often came into contact with the poorer classes. The poor ryots took opium for medicine, or as a special luxury. To these men it often meant life, and he thought that if deprived of opium, they would be driven to use spirits, ganja, and other still more deleterious drugs. He thought it would be desirable if some sort of prohibition were adopted to put a stop to the increasing cases of opium suicide. In reply to Mr. Wilson, the witness stated that he would not like his son or nephew, or any young man in whom he was interested to take opium except under medical advice. He also stated that there was reluctance on the part of many to admit the habit. He had himself taken opium for the last six years for medical reasons. He had tried four or five times to give it up but had fallen ill and was advised not to give it up.

Evidence of Rai Sheo Bux Bogla, Bahadur.

Rai Sheo Bux Bogla, Bahadur, in reply to the Chairman, said he was a merchant and banker, whose family originally came from Rajputana. He spoke of the use of opium by Rajputs and Sikhs. He considered that the use of opium amongst those races did not bring physical injury or demoralization.

In reply to Mr. Wilson, he estimated the proportion of Rajputs and Sikhs who take opium as a daily ration at seventy or eighty per cent.

In reply to Mr. Fanshawe, he said that he represented the Marwari community amongst whom the habit of opium-eating was fairly common. It was generally begun about the age of forty. His own country was Bikaneer.

Evidence of Maharaja Sir Norendra Krishna.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness said :—Generally the people of Bengal, especially in malarial, low and swampy districts, take a small

quantity of opium as a tonic to preserve their health ; the dose daily used is not exceeded by them, and it has no deleterious effect either on their moral or physical condition. People begin to take it for medical purposes, though after the disease is cured they continue it to prevent a relapse.

The prohibition of the cultivation of poppy lands would deprive the Government of a large amount of revenue derived from the manufacture and sale of opium, and I do not know that the Government can devise any other easy mode of raising this large income. Besides, the moderate use of opium does not lead to the commission of heinous offences. It is beneficial to health ; it is better than brandy or whiskey. He had no personal interest in poppy growing. He believed that the consumption of a moderate quantity of opium is not harmful to the persons who take it. It does affect the brain and has no depressing effects afterwards like the drinking of alcohol.

In reply to Mr. Wilson, witness said that if he had sons or young men in whom he was interested, he would not allow them to begin taking opium regularly in their younger days. He would not allow them to touch opium until they arrived at a ripe age, say fifty, if necessary for their health. In their younger days he would object to their touching opium, or any intoxicating drink. His opinion that the people of Bengal, especially in malarial swampy districts, take opium to preserve their health was based on what he had heard generally from others. He was personally acquainted with some of the Eastern districts of Bengal. When Deputy Magistrate in the service of the Government, he had visited Dacca, Farridpore and Mymensing, in which places people take opium. This was about forty-five years ago. He had lived in Calcutta since his birth except eight or ten years, when he had lived in the Mofussil. He had once visited his zemindari in the twenty-four Pergunnahs, about sixteen years ago. In his capacity as Senior Vice-President of the British Indian Association, he signed a letter to the Commission, in which it was stated that prohibition would reduce rents. His explanation of this was that the opium cultivators pay more rents to the zemindars than the cultivators of other food crops or grains. He admitted, however, that if the ryot cultivates sugarcane or other plants of his own inclination in the poppy growing lands, he could not claim reduction of rents. He could not cite a case where the zemindar had reduced the rent because Government had withheld the license to grow poppy. So far as that part of the letter of the British Indian Association was concerned, he had no personal knowledge, and referred the

Commission to the other members of the Association who have lands in the poppy growing districts.

In reply to Mr. Haridas Veharidas, witness said that did not think the habit of opium so bad as that of drinking.

In reply to Mr. Fanshawe, witness expressed the opinion that the habit of eating opium was gererally begun by middle-aged people who take small quantities after arriving at the age of fifty, when they find that their digestive power is weakened.

By the Maharaja of Dhurbhanga.—Q.—I suppose the chief objection of the British Indian Association to the abolition of the opium monopoly is that, in case the opium revenue were done away with altogether, Government would very likely have recourse to direct taxation, and I suppose the people of the country prefer the opium monopoly to any direct taxation ; is that the view of your Association ?

A.—They think that the opium monopoly should not be abolished.

Evidence of Maharaja Durga Churn Law, C. I. E.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness said that he was at the head of a large commercial concern. He attended, not as a representative of the British Indian Association, but to represent his own individual views. He expressed the opinion that people who consume opium have taken it as a remedy against miasmatic influences and several other diseases, such as diabetes, bronchitis and complaints arising from cold. His experience did not extend beyond Calcutta and Chinsurah. He had not heard of a single case of moral depravity of people who were accustomed to eat opium in moderation. On the contrary, he had always heard of the good effects of opium among people after they have reached about fifty. It prolongs life ; that is the general impression, and I believe it is a fact. It gives tone and spirit to the man who takes it. It is, so to speak, an instinctively adopted indigenous remedy or preventive against what are known to be the effects of the unhealthy sourroundings of the people. There would be a general discontent among the people if a new tax had to be imposed upon them in lieu of the revenue derived from opium. The zemindars in the opium districts would suffer by prohibition as they could not get the same rents for their lands.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—Under the Tenancy Laws can the ryot claim a reduction of his rent if he ceases to grow poppy ?

A.—I think he can.

Q.—Do you know of any case in which he has got a reduction ?

A.—I am not aware of any case.

Q.—Do you take any personal part in the management of your estates ?

A.—I do not take a large interest in the management of my estates now-a-days. The active management is left with my son.

The letter which he had signed was not a letter of the British Indian Association. Those members of that Association who signed it, did so on their own individual account.

Q.—It is dated from 18, British India Street; is that the office ?

A.—That is the office of the Association.

Q.—And I think the last signature is the signature of your secretary ?

A.—Yes, but he does not sign as secretary,

Q.—The first signature is the signature of one of your vice-presidents ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—This was given to me as a letter from the British Indian Association, is that wrong ?

A.—It was a mistake.

Q.—Still you signed it and it expressed your opinion ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Now will you explain it a little ? In paragraph three you state that "where a monopoly is so strict as that of opium is in India, it becomes practically prohibitive to the general body of the people;" that is your opinion ?

A.—Yes, it is as far as possible.

Q.—Then you say that "prohibition of the growth of the poppy and manufacture and sale of opium would practically mean unjustifiable interference"?

A.—So it will be.

Q.—But then it is already interfered with as regards the general body of the people ?

A.—Yes, so long as the poppy is allowed to be grown it is not a prohibition.

Q.—But so far as the general body of the people is concerned it is prohibited ?

A.—In cases where it was already allowed, if prohibition is to take effect, it will interfere with the rights of the people. It is already allowed by the Government to be grown in certain districts ; on what

ground is the Government to take away that right from the owner of the place ?

Q.—I must not answer questions, but ask them. I want to know why you say that prohibition is unjustifiable interference when in the greater part of India it is absolutely prohibited ?

A.—It is absolutely prohibited in other parts of India, but where prohibition does not exist, if Government tried to withdraw or to prohibit in those parts, it would be an interference with the rights of property there.

Q.—In the case of Assam, prohibition of the poppy was enforced twenty years ago ; do you consider that was unjustifiable interference with the rights of private property ?

A.—I have no knowledge of that interference, and therefore cannot answer that question. If the Government were bent upon poisoning the whole or the greater part of its subjects, I would certainly prohibit opium everywhere, but such not being the case, I do not see why there should be any attempt made to urge the Government to prevent the cultivation of opium.

Q.—If it is an interference with the rights of property and the liberty of the subject, is not that liberty already interfered with as regards the larger part of India ?

A.—We see that it is good for the country that that prohibition is made, because if the whole of India was allowed to grow opium, there would be a famine every year.

Q.—Then if it is good for the country that the prohibition is made to prohibit it entirely would be justifiable?

A.—I do not think so.

By the Chairman.—Q.—If you thought that opium was necessarily a poison you would consider that the policy of the Government should be changed ?

Q.—Yes, I would.

Asked by Mr. Wilson how he knew that the cultivators would be opposed to the change, he replied, It is fair to conclude that when their interests suffer they would be opposed to the change ; it is not that I have consulted them.

Q.—Then you speak not from what you know but what you conjecture ?

A.—I have not consulted them.

By Mr. Fanshawe :—He had no poppy cultivation in his own zemindari, and had no practical knowledge of it.

Evidence of Maharaja Sir Jotendro Mohun Tagore, K.C.S.I.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness stated that his property did not lie in the poppy growing districts. He believed that the moderate use of opium was beneficial to the people, but in cases of abuse it might bring on injury. He thought that the cases of abuse were relatively very few, and that medicinally opium was of great value to the people of India. He considered that a policy of prohibition would create a great deal of dissatisfaction, and would drive the people to an increased use of alcohol.

In reply to Mr. Wilson, witness stated that he had signed the letter of the British Indian Association with five other gentlemen. Asked whether he could throw any further light on the question put to the last witness about reducing rents, he replied ; the question stands in this way. When the ryots grow a crop which is less profitable than another, the zemindar is bound to reduce the rent by no legal act, but it is for his own interest as well as the interest of the estate that he should not claim the same amount of money or rent from him which the ryot used to pay when cultivating a crop which paid him better.

Q.—As a matter of fact when the Government withholds the license to cultivate the poppy from any ryot, does the zemindar reduce the rent ?

A.—Most likely he will have to do it. It was never tried. When a cultivator has been cultivating beetle-leaf or sugar-cane, and when by rotation or by some accident he cannot get an equally paying crop the zemindar is obliged to make a reduction in the rent; and it necessarily follows that the same thing will occur in a case of this kind.

Q.—Can you give any cases in which it has been done ?

A.—In my own estate several cases of the kind have occurred.

Evidence of Raja Peary Mohun Mookerjee, C. S. I.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness said that he held estates in five districts in the Bengal Presidency, none of them in the poppy growing districts. He agreed with the previous witnesses. He thought that greater restrictions might be introduced as regards smoking *chandu*.

In reply to Mr. Wilson, he said that he regularly visited his estates during the last thirty or thirty-five years. He had seen opium taken habitually as a preventive against fever and with good results. In some cases they take it for failing health, for failing powers of assimulation for the gradual decay of bodily power and a variety of causes.

In his native town of Utterpara he estimated the number of persons taking opium to be 821. This large proportion of opium takers might

be due to the large floating population. He thought that the Government monopoly is far from injurious, and that its abolition would result in a much greater use of opium in this country.

In reply to Mr. Fanshawe, the witness said that he knew hundreds of cases of moderate opium-eating. After a certain age, it was found very beneficial. It does not affect their health or their morals injuriously ; on the contrary, it renovates the health in the case of persons whose powers of assimilation have been failing, whose health has lost all elasticity, whose powers of nutrition have been diminished ; in all these cases opium does immense good, even in the case of young men of thirty-five. One of my nephews takes opium. He began when he was thirty ; he is now thirty-seven. The habit is not regarded as showing any want of respectability or as a vice, whilst the man who drinks alcohol labours under a social ostracism.

In reply to Mr. Wilson, witness said that the letter from the British Indian Association could not be considered as an official letter, because the question was not discussed formally at a meeting and a decision come to. This letter, however, represented the views of all the members of the Association whom he had had occasion to consult on the subject. In August last their Association did send a formal letter to the Viceroy upon this subject, but the present letter was not an official one. Asked why in the official letter of August last, the Association stated that "no proposal is made by the advocates of these measures in recouping the loss of revenue that this country would suffer at this critical time," he replied :—Because we have not heard that any proposal has been seriously made for recouping the revenue if the opium revenue is lost to the country.

Q.—Then you do not know anything of the publications of the of the society to which you are referring ?

A.—We refer simply to the resolution of Parliament.

Q.—I am referring to the Anti-Opium Society. Let me ask you, is Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, the late Judge of High Court, a member of your Committee ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Was he invited to sign this letter ?

A.—I believe he was not at the time in Calcutta.

Q.—Are you sure that he was not asked to sign this letter ?

A.—I am perfectly ignorant about it.

Evidence of Rajkumar Sarvadhikari.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness stated that he had signed the letter addressed to the Commission in his individual capacity and that he held the office of secretary to the British Indian Association. He concurred in the views expressed by the preceding witnesses. In reply to Mr. Wilson, he said that his committee had not considered this question since their memorial presented in August last. Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter was not asked to sign the letter addressed to the Commission. Witness was editor of the "*Hindu Patriot*." He could not tell how many copies of the paper were taken by Government. He should think about fifty copies, not more. Asked whether he had personal knowledge of the facts stated in the memorial, he said that he had come across many people who use opium. He was not familiar with any opium growing districts himself.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—You say that Government takes copies of the "*Hindu Patriot*," does it stand on any different footing from other papers in that respect?

A.—No.

Q.—Do you happen to know whether my own office, the Post Office, takes a copy of the paper or not?

A.—I think it does.

Q.—I suppose the Government Departments take it as they require it as an advertising medium, or whatever the reasons may be?

A.—As they send to other papers, so they send to us.

Evidence of Babu Saligram Singh.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness said that he came from a village in the district of Shahabad in Behar, in which opium is not largely consumed. Those who take it as a habit and for the sake of pleasure are generally Mahommedans. Not much opium is used in the district as a medicine. If a man takes opium except for medical purposes it is looked upon as improper.

Q.—Do you think that they would approve of Government prohibiting the use of opium for other than medical purposes?

A.—If opium be supplied freely to the people for medical purposes, if the effect of prohibition be not to interfere with that free supply, and if it does not lead to the imposition of any tax, the people would like to have some further restriction. There are already existing restrictions; but in spite of those restrictions we find *chandu* and *madak* being smoked by the people, and we also find in some cases that opium is taken

as a pernicious habit which leads to the ruination of people. If some restrictive measures could be adopted to stop the recurrence of those evils it would be very desirable. He had not thought of any scheme for further restriction.

Q.—Do you think it possible absolutely to prohibit the growth, manufacture, and sale of opium in British India for any other than medical purposes?

A.—I do not think at present that it is possible unless Government were to prohibit private persons from growing opium. If the Government were to withdraw the monopoly and leave it open, like indigo and other things, to private individuals, the evils might be much worse.

Q.—It has been said that the prohibition of poppy cultivation would reduce rents?

A.—Certainly as regards money rents according to law they could not be reduced, but in Behar and in parts of Shahabad and Gya rent is paid in kind; all my people in Patna and Gya districts invariably pay rent of poppy lands in money, with respect to poppy land, therefore, it is a matter wholly of unconcern with the landlord if the cultivation of the poppy be stoped, because the money rent established by law cannot be reduced. When the tenant agrees to pay a money rent it is his look-out what he cultivates, not the look-out of the landlords. If he does not wish to cultivate upon those terms, he can abandon the tenure.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—I am a Pleader in the High Court, and I know the law. I know that in no case can a tenant go to the landlord and ask for a reduction of his rent because he has ceased to grow opium.

Q.—It is stated on the top of the printed paper that I hold in my hand that you are nominated by the British Indian Association?

A.—When I sent in my manuscript statement those words were not there.

Q.—You say in paragraphs five and six that the growing of opium is not viewed as profitable now-a-days. I suppose that is so?

A.—That is so. My special reason for making that statement is that during September or October last I happened to be in my village and some common officer connected with the Opium Department came and reported to me that the lumbardar was not agreeable to cultivate opium in that village, and suggested that I should ask him or persuade him to enter into an arrangement with the Opium Department to cultivate some lands. I sent for the lumbardar, and told him that it was desirable that he should cultivate opium unless it was a losing business for him. I

could not compel him to do so, but if he chose he could do so ; he had a free option in the matter, but at the same time I told him it would be desirable if he could see his way to cultivate. The lumbardar is a man who enters in the contract on behalf of the other tenants. He agrees to take up one hundred bighas or fifty bighas and he brings in other tenants and distributes it between them. He brings the advances from the Opium Department and distributes them ; and finally when the opium is sent in he brings the price of it as it is supplied by the cultivators. There is only one man to whom they look up in the village, and he is the lumbardar. As I have said, I sent for him and asked him whether he was willing to cultivate, but he was not willing because the tenants generally were averse to doing what was not a very profitable business. This was in the village of Kalharia, near the town of Arrah. Later on I had a letter addressed to me or to my brother—I am not sure which it was—a letter from Mr. Sen (the son of Keshub Chunder Sen), an officer connect d with the Opium Department, saying that he would like to know why the tenants were averse to growing opium, and that he would like to have a conference with me on the subject. If I remember rightly, we said in answer that the reason was that it was not a very profitable business, and therefore they did not like to cultivate it.

Q.—Have you heard of anything of that kind before, or was that the first and only instance ?

A.—Before that I had also heard from those tenants that they were not very keen about cultivating opium ; I heard from people also in the Patna District.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—What conclusion would you found on that single instance as regards the large number of cultivators who cultivate the poppy in Behar, some 630,000 ?

A.—The man who came asked me to persuade a particular tenant to do it, and he said, "There are other villages where the tenants are also unwilling to cultivate."

Q.—Would you place any reliance upon this as proving general unwillingness to cultivate poppy when you have 630,000 cultivators to deal with ?

A.—Where the growth of sugarcane is fast increasing, as in Shahabad and also in Patna, and in some parts of Gya, there it would be a matter of indifference to the tenants and landlords whether opium or sugarcane is grown. So far as the tenants are concerned, they will prefer sugarcane, which is more profitable.

Q.—Does not the cultivation of sugarcane depend upon various conditions—upon whether there is a market and whether there is certain manure to be had, and various conditions of that kind?

A.—It does not depend upon that altogether. It requires three or four times watering; it takes a little more trouble to water.

Q.—Is it not the case that the cultivator who grows poppy is regarded as a good solvent tenant, likely to pay his rent punctually?

A.—There is this advantage, that when the advances are made, the man is able to pay his rent more readily from the money that he gets, and he is not put to the inconvenience of selling his grain to pay the landlord.

Q.—You think that the prohibition to cultivate poppy would not affect the landlord indirectly?

A.—Indirectly in regard to the payment of rent. In some cases there may be a delay on account of the man not growing poppy.

Q.—You expressed an opinion as to the injurious effects caused by opium. Do you mean by opium-eating in excess? If so, what would be the number of opium-eating cases in excess which have come within your own experience. Would they be few or many, speaking generally?

A.—They are few, and that in towns, not in the villages.

Q.—Would the majority of people who eat opium be those who eat it in moderation?

A.—There are a good number, regard being had to the population but I could not give you the percentage; the majority of people take it in small quantities.

Q.—Do you include in the use for medical purposes the cases of such persons as take opium at a later age?

A.—Yes, to prevent the effects of colds and chills. I admit that it is taken in some cases as a preventive against chills and colds.

Q.—With your knowledge of the country, do you think it is practicable to provide that people who want to obtain opium for this purpose should be able to do so while others should be prevented from obtaining opium for purposes not included under the head of medical?

A.—I have not considered over any scheme, and I should not like to adopt any scheme the effect of which may be to deprive those who want opium for the purposes of medicime of the opportunity of getting it.

By Mr. Wilson.—The lumbardar is the principal tenant of the village; he gets his name registered in the Opium Department and enters into a sort of agreement with that Department to get certain quantities of land within his village cultivated either by himself or by

others. For these lands he gets advances from the Opium Department.

Q.—Is he appointed by the Government or elected by the villagers?

A.—I should say both. The villagers choose and recognise him as their lumbardar, and the Government looks upon him also as a man through whom the advances can be distributed.

Q.—He is not a servant?

A.—There is no appointment.

Q.—Suppose the villagers do not like him, can they get rid of him?

A.—They will not cultivate the land at his instance if they dislike him. That is the most effective way of prohibiting him. He is something like a go-between between the Government and the tenant.

Q.—Does he get any profit out of it?

A.—Very little. Perhaps two pice in a rupee for the trouble of going and coming.

Q.—By Mr. Fanshawe.—He belongs to the village and he is a representative of the villagers?

A.—Yes.

Q.—But so far as any appointment goes?

A.—The Government does not appoint him.

Q.—In no way?

A.—No. But he is recognised by the Government Department as a go-between so far as opium is concerned.

Q.—He is put forward by the villagers as their representative?

A.—Yes.

Evidence of Dr. Mohendra Lal Sircar.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness stated that he was a member of the British Indian Association; that he received a circular asking him to attend and give evidence, not from the Association, but from Mr. Inglis, Mr. Lyall's Secretary. Some time ago a member of the British Indian Association asked him if he would like to give evidence before the Commission, and he said that he would have no objection if he was required. As a medical practitioner, his experience was limited chiefly to Calcutta. He regarded opium as having value, but not much, in affording relief from pains. He did not think it had a permanent value for this purpose. A pretty large percentage of opium-eating originates in the desire to obtain relief from pain. Opium is often recommended by opium-eaters who have themselves experienced some temporary relief from its use, but witness did not approve of such advice. By far the largest class of opium

eaters consists of persons who have taken to the habit for the sake of the pleasures which its intoxication brings on, the chief of these pleasures is what I may call sexual endurance. When once adopted, it is almost impossible to give up the use of opium. I have not observed any serious organic desease or moral depravity, from a moderate habitual use of opium. I have found it when taken in immoderate quantities to produce great mischief. It acts as a poison. Taken in immoderate doses opium often gives rise to fatal obstruction of the bowels and retention of urine from paralysis of the muscular fibre of the viscera ; or it may lead to the opposite conditions of diarrhœa, dysentery, and eneuresis. It often leads to a condition of the brain which makes the victim lead a most wretched and miserable existence of dullness and stupidity, the very picture of living death If the dose is suddenly increased, as it sometimes is, then there may be actual apoplexy.

Witness had recently visited two *chandu*-smoking dens and one *madak*-smoking den. The smokers were very familiar with me and confessed many things which I put down. In the first *chandu* shop that I visited all the smokers were males, and did not appear to be such as may be called poor. Indeed, one of them was a zemindar from the North-West. All of them seemed to be well nourished, and some of them even appeared to be robust. I entered into a pretty long and familiar conversation with them. They one and all confessed that they had begun to take to the smoking from the assurance they had received from smokers of its strengthening effects on the sexual powers and they told me that this invariably was the origin of what they all most emphatically called the pernicious habit.

The witness would desire that Government should abolish shops at which *chandu* or *madak* can be smoked or purchased. The smokers themselves would be glad if Government would abolish these shops. He considered opium-eating less pernicious than opium-smoking. He was opposed to the use of all intoxicating drugs, and he looked upon tea, coffee, cocoa, &c., as absolutely unnecessary for men. In his opinion, rest, healthy recreation, and adequate nourishment are all that man requries for the due performance of the functions of life. physical, and psychical. As a practical man, he thought it impossible to prohibit the use of opium, and that Government should strive to regulate its consumption as far as it can. He was not prepared with any specific suggestion, but considered that more stringent measures should be adopted to prevent abuse. In reply to Mr. Wilson, the witness explained that the heading of his statement, in which he was said to have been nominated by the British

Indian Association, had not been supplied by himself. He had headed his paper "Notes on opium-eating and smoking for the Royal Commission," when the print came into his hands, he found it altered. Only one other medical gentleman in India had received the distinction of C.I.E. He found opium to act as a palliative and seldom as a curative agent. It seems to arrest the progress of disease but this is seeming only in the majority of cases. The disease which appears to yield often returns with greater violence. Partly owing to the recklessness of practitioners many a patient has been driven into the habit of taking the drug, from which neither could he free himself nor could he be freed without causing a return of the suffering which had necessitated the use of the drug, or without fresh and peculiar sufferings due to the cessation of the drug's primary action.

The use of which he had spoken for sexual endurance, or prolongation of the sexual act, is afterwards followed by impotence. He did not go so far as to say that the habit cannot be broken, but the cases are very few and far between. The only depravity that he had observed was the unconquerable hankering after the drug. In both the *chandu* and *madah* smoking dens, the smokers said they would be glad if Government would abolish the shops. They knew they would suffer individually, but they would rather do so than that future generations should be entangled in a habit which entails such a perversion of the will, and in the end deprives them of the very power for the strengthening of which they prized it so much in the beginning;" and the owners of the shops who were themselves smokers did not dispute what their customers said. He did not put beer, tea, and opium on a level as things that he would like to see equally abolished. Tea, cocoa, and coffee he regarded as much more innocent than opium, but absolutely unnecessary.

By the Chairman.—Alcohol is a deadly poison, one of the worst poisons in existence for a man to take; infinitely worse than opium.

By Mr. Wilson.—Q.—Is beer worse than opium?

A.—Yes. Whatever contains alcohol is worse than opium as regards its effects on the physical as well as on the mental constitution.

Q.—Is that in your experience as regards Europeans as well as the Natives of India?

A.—I have had very little experience of Europeans who are opium-eaters as to whether the effect of beer and spirits is equal to, or worse than, the effects of opium. If the people take beer in moderate quantities they may not have body or mind diseased in any way, but generally

these things are never taken in moderate quantities. Europeans in India fare worse for their drinking habits in this climate. His practice was in Calcutta and in the suburbs. He did not know much of the habits of the poorer classes in the remote districts of Bengal.

By Mr. Fanshawe :—Q.—His statement that the largest class of opium-eaters take to the habit because of its pleasures, applied mainly to Calcutta. He had chiefly found opium-eaters among Mahommedans, but the habit belonged to all classes. His remarks were applicable more to the middle and upper classes than to the lower in Calcutta. The difficulty in giving up the habit applied to all cases, even to those who only take a grain a day, though it becomes greater with an increase of the doses. In the first *chandu* shop that he visited there were about ten and in the next about eight. The statements made to him by the smokers were volunteered. He simply asked them why they had taken to the habit, and they made that confession. He had not made any chemical or medical analysis enabling him to ascertain the effect in eating and smoking opium. He spoke from simple experience. He would not interfere with the man who habitually smokes in his house, but he thought that private gatherings or clubs for smoking should and could be prohibited.

Q.—There has beeen a certain amount of smoking going on in private places called smoking clubs. Would you propose to interfere with them ?

A.—It would be impossible to interfere with them.

He did not regard tea, coffee, or cocoa as nourishment at all, if it were not for the little milk and sugar with which they are mixed.

By the Chairman :—I am a graduate of medicine in the Calcutta University. I did not say that drinking tends to shorten life.

Q.—But you think it a pernicious habit ?

A.—I do not say it is a pernicious habit, but an unnecessary habit. The time devoted to tea-drinking and coffee drinking might be better occupied.

By Mr. Fanshawe.—Q.—Is it or is it not the case that the British Indian Association sent in your name with those of other gentlemen as the name of those who were ready to give evidence ?

A.—I did not know that before this was sent to me. I did not know that I was to come here as a nominee of the Association.

Evidence of the Hon'ble Gonesh Chander Chander.

I am a member of the Bengal Legislative Council and of the British Indian Association. I concur generally with what has been said by the previous witnesses Some of those who are addicted to the smoking of *madak* and *chandu* commit petty thefts and other minor offences, but the eating of opium in moderate doses has not been the cause of moral depravity of any kind among any class of persons.

Witness did not believe that the people of Bengal would be willing to bear the cost of prohibitive measures and he recommended no alteration of any sort in existing arrangements for the growth of the poppy and the manufacture and sale of opium. The prohibition of the poppy would be prejudicial, and would be difficult to maintain in view of the risks from smuggling.

By Mr. Wilson.—Witness was a member of the legal profession. He visited the outlying districts of Bengal once a year during the vacation. The evidence of Babu Saligram Singh to the effect that poppy cultivation was not profitable, and that the people did not care for it, did not at all affect his opinion as to its being one of the most valuable agricultural resources. So far as witness' information went, he did not think that Babu Saligram Singh was right. He would put the sale of opium under police regulations in Calcutta. He considered the arrangements as to growth and cultivation perfect ; but the retail sale ought to be put under further restriction.

By Mr. Fanshawe :—Eating opium in moderation has no injurious effects on the visible condition of the people or on their moral character. The practice is fairly common. All retail vendors of opium in Calcutta should be placed under the supervision of the police of the thanas in which their shops are.

Q.—What do you mean by that—that he would be liable to have his shop visited at all times, or that the police should check his issues or what?

A.—There should be some guarantee that purchasers do not use opium for other than lawful purposes.

Q.—How are the police to maintain that?

A.—In the some way as arms and ammunition are under the police supervision.

Q.—A register being kept of all purchases ?

A.—Some such thing ought to be done.

Mr. J. Prescott Hewett, Secretary of the Commission, was then called to explain how the statement of Babu Saligram Singh came to have

the words "a witness nominated by the British Indian Association" at its head. He stated that he had not had the paper printed, and that the heading was upon the paper when he received it from Mr. Dane or Mr. Inglis. He gave the same answer as to the statement of Dr. Mohendro Lal Sircar. With regard to the letter signed by six gentlemen, dated from No. 18, British Indian Street on which was written "Letter from the British Indian Association"; those words were written by his clerk.

Printed by
Joseph Culshaw, Methodist Publishing House, Calcutta.

Pam
Drugs
Opium

797

St Bart.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

ON THE

OPIUM TRAFFIC.

Special Report of the Evidence taken in India.

Part XVI. 13th & 15th December, 1893.

SITTING AT RANGOON AND MANDALAY.

PRICE ONE PENNY, or ONE ANNA, for each part.

Published by the
SOCIETY FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE OPIUM TRADE,
BROADWAY CHAMBERS, LONDON, S. W.
Also at the
METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, 45, BHARAMTALA ST., CALCUTTA.

The Royal Commission on Opium.

Evidence of Mr. P. M. Madoeray Pillay.

In reply to the Chairman (Sir James Lyall) the witness stated that he was an Honorary Magistrate and Municipal Commissioner in Rangoon and had been in Burma twenty years, almost entirely in Rangoon. He read the following statement : I am a merchant and a contractor for loading and unloading cargoes from vessels visiting this port. I am doing the largest trade in this line, besides I used to work for the Public Works Department, rice mills, and railway, etc., and own a saw mill and several parcels of paddy-land in Rangoon, Hanthawaddy, and Pegu districts. Most of the men whom I employ to carry out these works are people who come from the Madras Presidency, in Ganjam and Godavery districts. I engage an average of 1,500 men daily. These men are commonly known as Coringis; 90 per cent of these men are opium eaters, they look healthy and are very hardworking men; they start their work at six in the morning and work till 1 P.M., and resume their work at 2 P.M. and continue to 6 P. M. Some of the carrying men are always busy in carrying rice bags, each weighing 220 to 230 lbs., on their shoulders ; they take their meal at 4 A. M. and at 1 P. M., instead of mid-day meal they use to eat a small pill of opium and drink water. As soon as their work is over they take another pill of opium, and they return to their houses for cooking, etc. Unless these opium-eaters have opium they look like dead men and they cannot do their work. If they are suddenly stopped as to taking opium they are subject to severe sickness. When I was a passenger on board a steamer there were a large number of coolies coming across from the Madras Presidency here. Of course, they were very strict about carrying opium from one port to another, and all the opium was seized. Most of the men were very sick and never took a meal. Some of them were very dangerously ill, and I was obliged to ask the captain of that steamer to give them a little tincture of opium. After they had had it they got alright.

Q.—It was not sea-sickness, but from not getting opium ?

A.—Yes. They are accustomed to come across in the season, and then go back to their country.

Q.—Does the taking of opium seem to have any effect upon the moral or physical condition ?

A.—Not in the least. I can declare to the best of my knowledge and experience the eating of opium in no way affects their moral or physical condition. I have had great experience in travelling in Northern, Southern, and Western India and have had the opportunity of seeing several countries, even in the North-West Provinces, say in Fyzabad, etc., where almost all the people eat opium, both men and women, and also give opium-water to infants. I know for certain that several well-to-do Native gentlemen working in the Government, holding high offices, and land owners, are accustomed to eat opium. In Burma there are seventy-five per cent of labourers from Northern India and the Madras Presidency, who are the largest majority of inhabitants in Burma, doing all sorts of labour work, who are opium eaters.

Q.—What is your opinion about discontinuing the sale of opium ?

A.—If it is discontinued it will be the ruination of those people who have been already accustomed to it ; they will be subject to serious sickness, and we could not expect to get the work from them that we are getting now.

Q.—Why ?

A.—The opium-eater requires a good deal of exercise. If he eats opium and does not eat his food properly, he is subject to sickness.

Q.—Do not they become lazy from taking the opium ?

A.—No.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—Have you ever had to discharge any of your workmen on account of their taking too much opium ?

A.—No, I have not.

Q.—Have you had to discharge any on account of drink ?

A.—Yes, I have.

Q.—Have you had to discharge any on account of eating hemp preparation ?

A.—I have never come across any of this hemp : it is not used here. Ganja-eaters are not fit persons to work.

Q—As far as your experience goes as an employer of labour, the habit of opium-eating amongst Natives of India is not injurious ?

A.—No, it is not.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—How do you know that ninety per cent of these men are opium eaters ?

A.—Because I know them very well. Almost all these people eat opium. If I am not mistaken, I think I ought to have said ninety-five per cent.

Q.—Do those who do not take opium do their work well ?

A.—Yes ; but you have to consider the countries they come from.

Q.—You say that unless these opium-eaters have their opium, they look like dead men and cannot do their work : tell us how they look?

A.—I will explain it. If they have not got opium they are not so energetic, and do not work so well. They work slowly ; they do not care to work ; and every now and then they sit. If they get opium they are cheerful and run very fast and work. You can get more work done from those who eat opium than from those who do not eat it.

Q.—You say "in Burma there are seventy-five per cent of labourers from Northern India and the Madras Presidency who are the largest majority of inhabitants in Burma" : do you think that there are as many as seventy-five per cent ?

A.—Yes, the labouring class of men ; there are not many Burman workmen at all. The people from Southern India are the labouring classes here. On the railway, in buildings and in the cultivations, the Natives of India do almost all the work. It is very seldom that you find Burmans on the railway or clearing jungle, or cultivating.

By the Chairman.—Q.—Do you mean seventy-five per cent of them are opium-eaters ?

A.—Yes, of the labouring classes.

Q.—Do you say that ninety per cent of the Coringis take opium ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—And of the labourers from Northern India and Madras seventy-five per cent ?

A.—Yes seventy-five per cent.

By Mr. Mowbray.—The men go backwards and forwards between Madras and Burma. We get the same men again. They go in the months of July and August, and return in December and January. I have had experience of these men working for me for years and years. Opium, I believe, is increasing largely among them. I mean more people now eat opium than used to be the case, not that the man who eats opium takes a larger dose.

By the Chairman.—Q.—As far as you can judge from men that you have known for some years coming backward and forwards, they do not get any the worse for eating, do they ?

A.—No.

Q.—I suppose none of your men smoke opium ?

A.—No they never smoke it.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—At 1 P. M. they do not take a meal, do they but take opium ?

A.—No, they eat nothing at all at one o'clock.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—But when they are working they take a meal at one o'clock do they not ?

A.—No, never.

By the Chairman.—Q.—Do you know what the weight of opium is in the pill that they take ?

A.—I think it is as big as a peppercorn or a little larger.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—About two grains ?

A.—Yes, I think so.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—How long have you been able to watch the health of any particular man ?

A.—I have had experience of men eating opium and working under me for the last fifteen years.

Q.—Have you been able to watch the health of one man for fifteen years ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think they are really in as good health at the end of fifteen years as they were before ?

A.—Yes, the same. I see the same men year after year.

Evidence of Meung Hpo Mhyin, K. S. M.

In answer to the Chairman, the witness stated that he was a Burmese merchant and a Native of Moulmein, dealing in timber, rice, and the general produce of the country.

He read the following statement :—I have had experience amongst the Burmese and the Chinese in regard to the use of opium. In Burma mostly opium-smoking is prevalent. The habit is generally acquired amongst these people between the age of the fifteenth and the twentieth years. As to motives, they are oftener led by the bad example set before them. They are generally advised to smoke opium when intoxicated with alcohol to take away its effects, as it is supposed that opium serves as an antidote against the indisposing effect of alcohol. This bad habit once formed is seldom relinquished. The opium-smokers would rather spend all their income than give up the habit contracted. They go on increasing the dose as they grow in years. They become the wrecks of their former selves, physically weak, mentally unable to think for themselves, morally degraded. The foregoing remarks apply to the Chinese as well as the

Burmese. In Burma opium is not known to be protective against fever or to be of any use in malarious districts. Burmese do not believe opium to be a necessary element to enable working people to get through their daily toil ; they look upon the habit as disgraceful—even worse than alcohol. I think the existing system of granting licenses for the sale of opium tends to the spread of the habit. As to the measure to give effect to the policy of discountenancing opium-smoking, I would say in Burma that total abolition would be the best thing to be done, as they have done away in the case of *ganja*. It is desirable to prohibit the sale of opium. People of Burma would hail such a measure with delight. The loss of revenue resulting from such prohibition could be best met by either re-imposing import duty of piece-goods or by raising the salt duty in Burma, it is much lower here than in India at present.

Q.—Do you yourself think that the opium habit is worse than the drinking habit ?

A.—It is a very degrading thing to be considered an opium-smoker in Burma. A young man if he takes drink, but is not a habitual drunkard, is not considered as an outcaste from society ; but even a moderate smoker of opium is considered as an outcaste.

Q.—Both opium and alcohol are forbidden by the Buddhist religion ; why is there greater degradation with regard to opium ?

A.—The general demeanour is very disreputable.

Q.—Are opium saloons, the places where they smoke opium, supposed to be particularly bad places ?

A.—Yes, they are.

Q.—Are there any places for drinking liquor ?

A.—There are liquor shops.

Q.—Do people drink in liquor shops ?

A.—Only the low class of people drink in liquor shops. Burmese also, but very few in number.

Q.—Is the same disgrace supposed to be attached to the habit of taking a pill of opium as it is to the smoking of opium ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think the effect is as bad ?

A.—Yes, the effect is the same.

Q.—The Coringi coolies all take pills ?

A.—I have been employing Coringi coolies myself, and I have found a great many of them were opium-eaters. It seems to me that they were very badly off for it. When once the opium consumer gets a disease, especially the opium-smoker, he gets worse. The disease is very liable to stick to the man who smokes.

Q.—You say that opium is not supposed to be a protective against fever, or to be of any use in malarious districts ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you ever been in Arakan ?

A.—No ; but I have been in timber forests where malarious fever is most prevalent.

Q.—Did not the foresters take it ?

A.—No, none of them would take it to prevent fever.

Q.—They have been reported by officers to say that they must have opium ?

A.—That is not my experience. I used to employ two or three hundred men at a time in the season. I found amongst them ten per cent who were smokers, and who brought their pipes with them to the forests.

Q.—Were any opium-eaters ?

A.—Very few men in Burma eat opium.

Q.—But it has been reported by Government officers who are opposed to opium that the foresters say that they must have opium when they are in the forest ?

A.—I only found ten per cent. They are considered to be bad people, men who are of no consequence, and who cannot work properly. They joined the service in the forests. A man who could work and earn his living here would not join ; but you generally find that men of very low habits join the forest work, and amongst them you find some opium-smokers.

Q.—Is not opium much used as a domestic medicine in Burma ?

A.—No. If a patient is told that a dose of opium is given to him he will refuse to take it, simply because he considers if once he takes opium his disease will be liable to be prolonged. If a man finds out that opium is the cause of his going to sleep, when the doctor gives him a sleeping dose he will not take it.

Q.—You are speaking of pious, respectable Burmese ?

A.—Even an ordinary man. It is not on account of his religion, but it is on account of his belief that once he takes opium his disease, whatever it may be, will not go away from him easily.

Q.—He will think it fixes the disease upon him ?

A.—He thinks it will become chronic: he considers opium is only good for a short time.

Q.—Would not total prohibition be rather hard on the Chinese and Shans who are great opium-eaters ?

A.—As far as my experience goes, I do not think it would injure their health. They might suffer for a while and get weakened for a month or so, but after that they would get on all right without smoking opium. Many of my acquaintances, well-to-do Chinamen living in Rangoon, smoke opium. I have in my mind especially one man now in Rangoon. He smoked opium, and he used to get thin and weak. About two years ago he gave up smoking and he became healthy and went about his business. He has commenced to smoke again, and he is getting very thin and weak, I asked him why he commenced again, and he told me he could not give up the habit. His friends have enticed him to smoke and now he is getting bad and ill again.

Q.—Is it not the case that in the Burmese King's time, when opium-smoking was severely punished, still a great deal of opium was brought into the country ?

A.—Not a great deal. It was smuggled by the Kachins and Chinese. They gave some young Burmese men opium and seduced them into bad habits.

Q.—If total prohibition were ordered now, do you think there would be much smuggling or not ?

A.—So far as Upper Burma goes, the Chinese frontier smuggling could be prevented. I could not say as to seaports, however.

Q.—Have you been along that country and Upper Burma ?

A.—Yes, I have travelled in that country.

Q.—Do you think that smuggling could be easily prevented ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There is a great deal of opium amongst the Shans, Kachins and Chinese in the Yunnan district ; it is a forest country and it has not a great many paths through it ?

A.—Yes, it is a forest country.

Q.—How are you going to stop it ?

A.—It is a very hilly country, and there are roads and passes and country stations. I would prevent it in the same way as you prevent arms and ammunition from being imported from China. There is not a single gun imported.

Q.—But a gun is rather a different thing to opium ?

A.—You prevent gunpowder.

Q.—At present are there not a great many prosecutions for illicit possession of opium ?

A.—Seventy-five per cent. of the prosecutions are owing more to opium being sold by licensed farmers than they are entitled to sell, not to real smuggling ; the opium found in the possession of a man who has more than he is legally entitled to is the same as opium issued from the Government treasury.

Q.—How is this opium discovered ?

A.—By Magistrates and others. The informer goes and tells that a certain man is in possession of so many tolas of opium, or so much more than he should possess. The police pounce upon him, and it is generally found in his house or in his possession.

Q.—Who are these informers—what sort of people are they ?

A.—They are mostly men hanging about having nothing to do.

Q.—Is not there a danger that these people would put a little bit of opium into a man's house ?

A.—Yes, there is a danger of that. Such a case only comes up occasionally ; it is not the general rule. I do not think people could afford to buy opium to put into another man's house.

Q.—These informers get rewards ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do the police often let these people go—take a bribe from them ?

A.—There are some instances in which that is supposed to have taken place.

Q.—Do you think it is necessary to suddenly stop the supplies to all habitual consumers, Burmans and Chinese and Shans ?

A.—Yes. So far as Burma is concerned, there has been no harm done by stopping the whole thing. You have suddenly stopped *ganja*, and there were a lot of *ganja* consumers here in Burma. No harm was done by suddenly stopping *ganja*, except that there might have been a little prosecution here and there. As time went on the people stopped smuggling, though they did attempt to smuggle it at first.

Q.—Were not *ganja* smokers nearly all Indians?

A.—There were a great many Burmans who were *ganja* smokers; in fact there were more *ganja* smokers than opium smokers. Since you stopped *ganja* I think people have commenced to smoke opium. Many men have told me that they contracted the habit of smoking opium through the alcohol habit.

Q.—If you stop opium, will not these men, who are probably the most self-indulgent and least respectable men among their nation, take to alcohol if they can get alcohol and cannot get opium?

A.—I cannot say exactly how far they would take to alcohol, because these are two opposite influences. Opium causes a man to be weakly and drowsy, and alcohol makes him excited. When a man could not get opium, I do not know whether he would take alcohol or not.

Q.—A Burman generally likes being excited, does he not?

A.—Yes, more or less he does.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—You said, I believe, that some of the coolies you employ smoked opium?

A.—Not the Natives of India, but Burmese coolies. In Upper Burma we have mostly Burmese coolies.

Q.—You were not speaking of the class of coolies employed in Rangoon in loading and unloading ships?

A.—No.

Q.—Have you any experience of them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Are there any opium-smokers amongst them?

A.—No.

Q.—Is there a large number of opium-eaters?

A.—Yes, nearly half the number of coolies I employ. I know more about the Burmese and Chinese, with whom I come in contact, than I do about the Natives of India.

Q.—I rather thought that you were speaking of these classes of Natives employed in loading and unloading ships in Rangoon; but now I understand you to say that you have no personal experience of them?

A.—I have had experience of them, but I have not come so closely in contact among them as I have with Burmese and Chinese. I have employed them as coolies, and I have found, generally speaking, that about fifty per cent of them were opium-eaters. I found them to be generally

weakly and sickly, compared with the same class of men who are not opium-eaters.

Q.—Did you ever make enquiries in order to get non-opium-eaters because they were better workmen?

A.—It was impossible to get all non-opium eaters. When one hundred coolies were engaged forty or fifty would be found to be opium-eaters, and they would be sickly.

Q.—I suppose you have found sickly men among opium-eaters and non-opium-eaters?

A.—The majority have been non-opium-eaters.

Q.—You speak of the opium-smoking habit being generally acquired amongst the people between the ages of fifteen and twenty; are you speaking then of Chinese?

A.—Yes, Chinese boys born in this country.

By Mr. Pease.—The amount of salt duty is one rupee a maund here, and in India it is Rs. 2-8-0 a maund.

Q.—How for is the evidence you have given, the view of the Burmese people generally?

A.—I think they all agree with me. I have taken some pains to enquire into this matter, and I have found that this is the prevailing opinion of the people.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Have you consulted the Chinese as to their view?

A.—Yes, I have.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Tell us what you think the view of the Chinese is?

A.—I have spoken to Chinese people before, and wthout exception they agreed with me.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Why have they not come forward here?

A.—I think some are coming here.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—You are a merchant, and I suppose you have transactions with Chinese merchants?

A.—Yes, I have.

Q.—Are those with whom you have transactions mostly opium-smokers?

A.—Half of them are opium-smokers.

Q.—Would this description you give apply to that half,—that they are "physically weak, mentally unable to think for themselves, and morally degraded?"

A.—I generally find that most of my Chinese friends who smoke leave the management of their business entirely in the hands of their managers and subordinates. Generally, they are sickly and complain of being ill, although they sometimes get on well. I have told them it was on account of their smoking opium. They have admitted that it was, but they say they cannot give it up.

Q.—Do you suggest that half the Chinese merchants here who smoke opium are unable to attend to their business?

A.—I say this in general. One of my Chinese friends who smokes opium admits himself that it is bad. He says, "I cannot give it up, because I contracted the habit when I was young." They all say it is very bad: not one defends himself.

By the Chairman.—Q.—It is also against their religion, too: most of them are Buddhists, I suppose; and according to the ideas of Buddha and Confucius, opium is a very bad thing, is it not?

A.—Yes, it is.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Are most of the Chinese you know Buddhists?

A.—They are Buddhists by name, but not so much by practice.

Evidence of The Sawbwa of Thibaw, examined through an interpreter.

By the Chairman.—My State is in the Northern Shan States. It is the largest of the four large States, and is called Thibaw.

Q.—Is there much opium grown in that State?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is the opium exported or used in the country?

A.—It is imported from other countries and some is made in the country also.

Q.—Is not some exported to China from your country?

A.—No.

Q.—Is it all used in the country?

A.—No, it is sent to other Shan States.

Q.—Does opium go from the other Shan States to China?

A.—No.

Q.—Are there Chinamen in your State as well as Shans?

A.—Yes. Very few live in the State. They come down once a year in large parties to trade.

Q.—How is the opium used ?

A.—It is smoked and eaten, but more people smoke it than eat it.

Q.—What in your opinion is the effect of opium-smoking,—is it bad or good ?

A.—If they eat it, it is bad, and if they smoke it, it is bad, both equally bad.

Q.—How long has the eustom of eating and smoking opinm existed among the Shans ?

A.—For a very long time, about two or three hundred years.

Q.—What do the common people think ; do they say why they do eat it ?

A.—Thy say it is very nice to smoke, and it makes them feel very happy thoughts.

Q.—Do they think it is very good to keep them in health ?

A.—No, it is very bad. Those who take it have short lives.

Q.—Do the eommon people think it is good for their health ?

A.—It is the eommon opinion that it is not good.

Q.—Do they do it for pleasure, or is there any other reason ?

A.—They take it to rejoiee their hearts ; but their lives are short.

Q.—Do they drink any liquor or spirit ?

A.—Yes, they do. Loeally-made liquor, made from riee.

Q.—Is that as bad as opium ?

A.—It is not bad if you take it is as medieine, but it is a very bad thing to drink for pleasure.

Q.—Is opium ever used for medieine, and not for pleasure ?

A.—Very little.

Q.—What sort of disease is opium used for as medicine ?

A.—It is taken for insomnia, diarrhœa, and internal pains.

Q.—Has it been the eustom among your family to smoke or to eat opium ?

A.—I tried when I was young, just a little bit, but I gave it up.

Q.—Are you in favor of total prohibition of opium in your State ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How would you do it ?

A.—I would prevent the growing of it.

Q.—Would not the people eomplain very mueh ?

A.—If they got enough opium to smoke for their lives, well and good : but I do not want any more eaten in future generations. The people who smoke opium, when they have not got it, never die. Thieves sometimes are put in prison and they are not allowed to smoke, and they get rid of the habit quite soon.

Q.—But do not the people make a profit out of the cultivation of the poppy ?

A.—Yes, they do get a profit, and the State gets a revenue from opium.

Q.—If the men who plant opium no longer plant it, would they complain ?

A.—I do not think they ought to make complaints, because they can grow other things and trade in other ways.

Q.—How long have you held the opinion that opium is a very bad thing ?

A.—Ever since I was quite young.

Q.—Why do not you try to stop it in your own State ?

A.—Because the other States will not stop their trade, and if I tried to stop it, all the people would hate me.

Q.—Would your own people dislike you if you tried to stop it ?

A.—I do not think the people in my own country would dislike me if I told them that it was not right for them, and that it was a bad thing for them.

Q.—Why have you not done it then ?

A.—I cannot very well stop it, because the people sell it secretly sometimes.

Q.—But you have never tried to stop the cultivation ?

A.—No I have not tried to stop it.

Q.—Do you think if you tried to stop it, the people would obey you ?

A.—They would do it and they would not be angry.

Q.—If they would do it and not be angry, why have you not done it ?

A.—I have looked upon it in much the same way as eating betel, and I do not think much of it. It slipped my memory,

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—How many amongst the men in your State smoke opium ?

A.—About five per cent. There are not very many who use opium.

Q.—Do any of the old people use opium ?

A.—They never live till they get old ; they die. They have very short lives if they smoke opium. No old people eat it.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Do you think the rules which are to stop the Burmese from buying opium ought also to apply to the Shans throughout your country ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think that the other Shan Chiefs would agree to give up opium cultivation in their country, if you gave it up and the English Government wished it ?

A.—They would be willing to stop it.

Q.—How many people are there in your State ?

A.—About 100,000.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—How many years have you been at the head of your State ?

A.—Thirty years.

Q.—You were head of your State when Thebaw was king in Mandalay in the old days, I believe ?

A.—I was at one time at the head of the State before the English went to Mandalay.

Q.—At that time opium was forbidden in Mandalay ; was it not ?

A.—Yes, I heard that orders were given not to sell any opium ; but the rule was not properly enforced, as far as I know.

Q.—You did not at that time forbid it in your State ?

A.—I did not say anything about it ; I did not try to prevent it ; I let matters be as they were.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Did the Burmese King ever try to prevent the consumption of opium in the Shan States ?

A.—No, he did not.

Evidence of Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Hugh Johnstone, M.A., M.D., I.M.S.,

By the Chairman.—Q.—I believe you are Senior Civil Surgeon in charge of the General Hospital, Rangoon ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How long have you served ?

A.—I have been over twenty-five years in the service, most of my time having been spent in Burma, with the exception of two years in the

Medical College Hospital in Calcutta. I resided in Mandalay about six years, one year at Akyab and the rest in Rangoon. The races I have come in contact with are the Burmese, Chinese, and Natives of India.

Q.—What personal knowledge have you of the use and abuse of opium amongst the Natives of India and amongst the Burmans ?

A.—Of the use of opium among the Natives of India I have not much personal knowledge. Although Resident Medical Officer in a large hospital, I saw little of its effects, either of its use or abuse and although I have conducted more than 100 *postmortems* I never saw any pathological lesion that could be ascribed to the use of opium. Among the Burmese I have found the use of opium most extensive in Arakan, although the Burmese use it elsewhere. Among the prisoners in the Akyab Jail a good many were opium-eaters. Physically, they were healthy enough looking and good enough constitutions—and the sudden deprival of opium in the great proportion of them did not seem to have any bad effects beyond distress, especially in the young. Among the older and those who had continued the habit for a longer time and consumed greater quantities the process had to be more gradual. In the *post mortems* of those who had died from other diseases, but were known to be opium users, there was no lesion that could be ascribed to the effect of opium.

Q.—What have you to say with regard to opium-eating among the Chinese ?

A.—It was at Mandalay that I came in contact chiefly with the Chinese opium-eaters. I was suddenly called one night to one of their gambling houses where in a brawl a Chinaman was wounded, his abdomen being laid open to the extent of seven inches with protrusion of the intestines. This man was an opium-eater and the one who did it a shumshoo (rice-spirit) drinker. The man recovered without a bad symptom, his wound healing up by first intention. These gambling houses are filled chiefly with opium-smokers and shumshoo-drinkers. Having been successful in this case I was often called in again on account of wounds received in these brawls, and it was almost invariably the rule that the disturbance arose from the shumshoo-drinker and not the opium-smokers. In these gambling houses, though the class of Chinese were not the best, I could not say that I saw any ill-effects from the use of opium. They were physically in good health ; it never interfered with the healing of their wounds or in the treatment of other diseases

that I saw. In these places where there was so much to excite them they were not quarrelsome like the shumshoo-drinkers; neither did they seem to be morally debased. I enquired of many of them what led them to begin to use opium. Among many of them it seemed to be an acquired habit like smoking tobacco, and only thought of in that way; amongst others again to relieve pain or cure illness; and all considered it a preventive of fevers, dysentery, diarrhœa, and cholera. Certainly what I saw among these Chinese did not at all correspond with the accounts I had heard of the awful ravages the use of opium caused to the health and morals of opium-consumers. I have seen a very few old emaciated men suffering from chronic diarrhœa and dysentery, said to be the result of its abuse, but these were doubtful cases. All these races consider its use a prophylactic in malarious fevers and bowel-complaints.

Q.—Have you ever employed it yourself?

A.—I have often employed it myself in treating malarious fevers with good results, often staving off an ague fit if given an hour before its usual period of seizure, and at the least modifying its severity and adding greatly to the patient's comfort. Quinine and opium combined will often be successful when quinine alone fails. The value of opium in bowel-complaints is known to all these races. There is another class of cases which occurs in malarial districts, and which induces the use of opium, and that is malarial neuralgia. In malarial districts these racking pains in all parts of the body render the life of the individual miserable, sleepless at night, and unable to work during the day. Opium in this state has been found by the inhabitants of these districts to be a great boon, and I have no doubt is often the original cause of the habit, and these people will tell you if they had not opium they could not live there. The moderate use of opium has no baneful effect on the health and constitution, as far as my experience goes, and the effects of its abuse has come so little before me that I could give no particular lesion that it causes in the human economy.

Q.—Have you formed any opinion of its effects upon morals?

A.—Of its baneful effects on morals I have seen none, although it is said to lead to crime and insanity. During my charge (four years) of the Lunatic Asylum in Rangoon a certain number of insanes were admitttd with opium-eating as the alleged cause, and this as a cause I considered doubtful, and even if true they are not a large proportion. Opium is not such a great cause as *bhang* or Indian hemp. During the many years I have been in large hospitals in India it would be strange

if the effects of the use of opium were so deleterious to the people consuming it, that no more cases, whose physical health should have failed, would have become inmates in the hospitals. In the Rangoon General Hospital there are no records of any one being admitted suffering from the effects of either the use or abuse of opium. There is no want of cases suffering from the use and abuse of alcohol, and I cannot say these are on the decrease.

By Sir William Roberts.—There are about 300 beds in the Rangoon General Hospital, these are generally filled; 280 or 285 is the general average, I think, daily.

A.—I have been in sole charge for four years; I was ten years Second Civil Surgeon in the hospital. Altogether I have been there since 1878—fourteen years. I have been nearly eighteen months at home out of that.

Q.—You are not as a medical man cognisant of the opium habit as a cause of disease?

A.—No. No cases of opium abuse have come into the hospital, as far as I have seen in the records of the hospital.

Q.—You spoke of a belief of many of the people amongst whom you have worked, that opium is a prophylatic against the various conditions of ill-health in malarious districts?

A.—Yes, they considered it as such, both the Natives of India and Burmese.

Q.—Did you gather that from conversation with them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You are very positive about that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Amongst the Burmans?

A.—Yes, amongst the Burmans and the Natives of India.

Q.—Do they smoke or use opium in malarious districts as a domestic remedy?

A.—As far as I know, they do,

Q.—Have you the means of ascertaining that fact?

A.—No, no means other than what they told me, their admission of it; I never heard them state it.

Q.—You have their direct testimony to that effect?

A.—Yes, certainly.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Are Natives here usually treated by doctors who treat them upon the Western system, or are they usually under the care of their own medical men in Rangoon ?

A.—In Rangoon the Natives of India are generally treated by Europeans in the hospital ; the Chinese do not come very often to the hospital, but both Burmese and Natives of India come to the hospital for treatment. Outside the hospital a great many of them are treated by myself, but there are more treated by private practitioners, I mean, not Government servants.

Q.—Are there many Native practioners ?

A.—Yes, but a good many of them practise the European method.

Q.—Do you think these opium consumers who come to the hospital while they have no special disease may not have the state of their general health considerably lowered by the practice of eating or smoking opium ?

A.—I have seen no occasion for saying that the health of those who come into the hospital has been lowered by the use of opium.

Q.—Then it is a practice to which you see no objection ?

A.—I have never seen any ill-effects in those who take it.

Q.—Would you recommend any young man in good health to commence the practice of eating or smoking opium ?

A.—No.

Q.—Why not ?

A.—I would not recommend it any more than I would recommend a person to use anything in excess.

Q.—Moderately ?

A—Moderately I do not see any objection to it at all, no more than a moderate use of alcohol.

Q.—Have you found that the habit of taking opium is exceedingly easy to give up ?

A.—I do not know that a man would find it more difficult to give it up than in the case of an alcohol drinker.

Q.—You say, "the sudden deprivation of opium in the great proportion of them did not seem to have any bad effects beyond distress." It did distress them ?

A.—Yes, it distressed them by the sudden deprivation of a thing they had been using.

Q.—You do not mention anything with regard to the older ones?

A.—According to the length of time and quantity of opium that made the process of cutting it off gradual.

Q.—Why did you do that?

A.—With the idea that probably it might interfere with their health in jail.

Q.—Was it to reduce their distress, or for fear that it might be fatal?

A.—To reduce their distress. I never saw a fatal case from its deprivation.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—With reference to your jail experience, I suppose the common practice is cut off the supply of opium altogether?

A.—Yes, when I was there it was the rule to cut it off immediately. In exceptional cases, if we found it was too much, we would knock it off gradually, and not suddenly.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Have you met with any cases of Burmese objecting to take opium as a medicine for fear of acquiring the habit?

A.—No, I never found them object to it.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Is Arakan a particularly malarious district?

A.—Yes, it is a very malarious district.

Q.—Do you attribute the more extensive use of opium among the Burmese of Arrakan to the fact that it is a malarious district?

A.—That is what I attribute it to.

By the Chairman.—Q.—When you were at Mandalay I believe opium was prohibited?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you any reason to believe that it was carried on secretly by the Burmese?

A.—Yes, it was.

Q.—How did you ascertain that?

A.—It was only by hearsay. I heard they used to smuggle it. I heard that bundles of opium were brought in secretly to Mandalay by steamers coming up from Rangoon. It was said that it was brought across from India by Assam overland.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Is any supposed to have come from China?

A.—I have never heard of it coming from that direction.

By the Chairman.—Q.—Do you think if opium is prohibited in Burma that it will be smuggled in ?

A.—They would attempt to smuggle it in no doubt.

Evidence of Mr. Leong Shain Tuck.

By the Chairman.—I am a Chinese *cutch* merchant of Rangoon. A *cutch* merchant is one who busy goods up-country and sells them here. I deal in dyeing goods.

The witness then read the following statement :—I have lived in Lower Burma all my life, and have observed the effects of opium amongst Chinese and Burmese. Amongst the Chinese in Lower Burma about twenty per cent of the men smoke opium, and very few women. I have never met a woman who smoked, but I know that there are some. The Chinese do not eat opium, except when they are unable to obtain it for smoking. Some begin at about fifteen or sixteen years of age, but most at about twenty. They almost always begin amongst their friends, from seeing others smoke. The habit can be given up without much difficulty when a person has not long been a smoker. I know of several who have had to give it up in prison. There is no clear difference between moderate and excessive opium-smoking. Those who take opium only occasionally do not suffer much, those who take it regularly soon suffer greatly. If they cannot get opium at the usual time, they shiver and sweat and are quite unfit for work. They like more and more to smoke, and they cannot work like those who do not smoke. Smokers who are poor and cannot get enough money to buy opium take to thieving and other bad practices. Those who are better off are not so much affected. A friend of mine who has tried to break off the habit several times has taken to it again, because friends have come and asked him to smoke with them. He says it is no benefit to him, only spending money ; but he cannot give it up. He says it is a bad habit. Among Chinamen who do not smoke themselves the habit is always considered a disgraceful one. Its effects are are also thought to be deadly poisonous. It will be a great mistake to attempt to prohibit the sale of opium to Burmans and not to Chinese ; the Chinese will smuggle it and sell to the Burmans. The Chinese suffer as much as the Burmans from smoking opium, and it will be a kindness to the Chinese to prevent them from procuring the drug. The respectable merchants are all against the habit of smoking, though some of the smokers might object to being deprived of the drug.

Q.—Were you born in China?

A.—Yes.

Q.—To what religion do you belong ?

A.—I am a Buddhist.

Q.—Has any of your family ever smoked opium?

A.—No, none of my family, but lots of my friends and others.

Q.—You say it affect a man's health very much?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Does it generally affect his power of doing business?

A.—Smoking will always affect him. He must waste his time.

Q.—Is he less clear in his head?

A.—It is only the smokers who tell about dreaming; they are always talking that they can get good sense from it, but when they are tight like a drunkard who has been drinking, they dream. I consider it a bad habit.

Q.—Do many poor Chinamen who become beggars become quite ruined by opium?

A.—It must be so: they spend money every day. They buy one tola's worth perhaps. They earn about two rupees, and they are obliged to give for opium one rupee. They have not got sufficient for their own living, and they are compelled to do all kinds of mischief.

Q.—Do they become beggars? How do they live?

A.—Several of them have become beggars and have asked for help. There is their own society and they go and stay there. I am speaking of those who are unable to work.

Q.—The society supports them?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Does the society give them opium?

A.—No, it would not give them opium. Some people help them.

Q.—Out of one hundred smokers how many do you think get ruined like that?

A.—Gradually spending money must be ruining them. The man who smokes must be ruined gradually. He spends every day about half the income he gets and he must be ruined.

Q.—Some rich men smoke?

A.—It would affect their incomes very greatly.

Q.—You mean that any poor man would be ruined?

A.—The poor man would be greatly affected.

Q.—I think you said that poor men eat opium?

A.—When they are going on board steamers they are obliged to swallow it ; but if they are in their own house or go to a friend's house they always smoke. They enjoy smoking more than eating. A friend of mine went to prison and he had to give it up because he could not get it there. When he came out of the jail, he was very stout and healthy. But a few months afterwards his friends asked him to smoke, and he began to smoke again.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Did he keep up his health when he began to smoke again ?

A.—I have seen him myself getting thin, and he was not so stout as when he came out of jail.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—I suppose smoking does not produce much effect among the Chinese who are in good circumstances ?

A.—The wealthy people smoke just to enjoy themselves, in order to pass the time. Lots of my friends have asked me to smoke too, It would not injure rich people as quickly as it does the poor people.

Q,—But you think that at length it does injure their health ?

A.—In the long run it must be injurious.

Q.—Do you know as a matter of fact that it does ?

A.—Yes, I have seen it with my own eyes. I can instance the case of Park Chan who gave evidence yesterday.

[The witness then produced a copy of his statement with a written foot note signed by about thirty Chinese residents of Rangoon to the effect that they agreed in the views expressed by him. He explained that having received from Mr. Alexander a copy of Mr. Selby's pamphlet on the opium question, with Chinese illustrations depicting the downward progress of the opium-smoking, he had gone round amongst his friends, showed them the pamphlet, and obtained their signature to the foot note. Amongst the signatures he said was that of Dr. Ah Nem, who gave evidence yesterday and who alleged that he had been misrepresented by the interpreter. (It appeared subsequently that Dr. Ah Nem's signature was not in fact amongst those appended to the foot note, and that Mr. Tuck was mistaken in thinking so.) Objection was made by Mr. Mowbray, M. P. to receiving evidence at second hand from persons not appearing before the Commission personally, and especially in the case of a person who had given evidence the previous day to the contrary effect : the Commission therefore decided not to receive this statement and to omit all mention of it from their report.]

EVIDENCE TAKEN AT MANDALAY.

Evidence of Surgeon-Major Dantra.

By the Chairman, Sir James Lyall.—I am Civil Surgeon at Mandalay? The conclusions I have arrived at are the result of observations made during my long residence of nearly twenty years in India (chiefly Bombay Presidency) and over fifteen years in Burma; and in the latter place being in charge of big jails for the last thirteen years. The extent of the consumption of opium among the Natives of India is just about the same as it was twenty years ago, but among the Burmans it is no doubt increasing. Under moderation it does not produce any ill-effect on the physical or mental health; if any thing, it improves the latter and affords greater staying power to the body. Excess, no doubt, impairs appetite, and the individual gets emaciated, but it never renders him so objectionable to society in general as excessive drink does. As in everything else, perhaps there is a tendency among a few of the Burmans to go to excess; but the Natives of India use it in moderation. By using it in moderation, their intellect becomes clear and they are better fitted to attend to their work, either physical or mental. In travelling and making long marches, involving great fatigue and privation, they have found opium one of the most useful articles to possess, more especially when they have to march through malarious districts having a bad water-supply and scarcity of provisions. It is one of the most effectual prophylactics against malaria and bowel-complaints, and when attacked with these complaints it is a very good preventive. These observations apply to both Burmese and Indians. Results of sudden complete cutting off of opium have never proved serious in my hands. In jails for years I have invariably stopped giving opium to all prisoners immediately they are admitted into the prison, and no doubt they have left off food for two or three days, have got diarrhoea, and complained of pains and aches all over the body, etc.; but these symptons soon pass off and they do not feel any the worse for leaving it off; but I believe immediately they go out of jail and begin to experience the trials and troubles of this world, they again take to using it, and if then cannot get opium, they take the alcohol, which in my opinion, works a hundred-fold greater mischief than any amount of opium.

Q.—Where did you receive your medical education?

A.—In Aberdeen and in London. I was also in Bombay for about six months. I was three years in Aberdeen and two years in London. Until I went to England, all my life was spent in the Bombay Presidency.

After passing in England. I came to Calcutta for a very short time and then I came straight to Burma. I have been in Burma since 1877.

Q.—When you say "the extent of the consumption of opium among the Natives of India is just about the same as it was twenty years ago," you are speaking about the Natives of India in Burma?

A.—Natives of India in Burma as well as in India. In Burma the majority of the Mahommedans and Hindus use opium habitually but the Mahommedans use more than the Hindus.

Q.—The Coringi coolies use it a great deal, do they not ?

A.—Yes, but not to the same extent as the Mahommedans do, as far as my observation goes. Most of them are artisans; a few of them are traders.

Q.—Do they smoke or eat opium?

A.—The Mahommedans generally eat it; they smoke it too, but they generally eat it.

Q.—Have you formed any opinion as to the relative effects of the eating habit and of the smoking habit ?

A.—It is a matter of degree, as far as my observation goes : smoking prolongs the pleasure, eating is finished in a short time, the smoking process goes on and the smoker spends more time over it.

Q.—In your opinion, neither habit in moderation is prejudicial ?

A.—No.

Q.—Is excess commoner amongst smokers or amongst eaters?

A.—I think excess depends more upon the pecuniary circumstances of the individual. If the men have money there is a tendency to go to excess.

Q.—You say that in moderation you think it affords greater staying power to the body?

A.—Yes. A man after walking ten or twelve miles feels tired and he takes a little opium, and he rests, say, for a half or a quarter of an hour, and then he will be able to go on another four of five miles further without feeling any discomfort ; whereas if he had not taken any opium, he would quite collapse and he would not be able to go any further. I am speaking more especially now of those who have been in the habit of taking opium.

Q—You say that there is a tendency among a few of the Burmans to go to excess; why do you think that shows itself especially among the Burmans?

A.—From my knowledge of the Burmese, they are a very impulsive sort of people. It is not only in eating and smoking opium alone, but there is a tendency to go to excess in everything they do.

Q.—Does the same tendency show itself in drinking ?

A.—Yes ; if anything, there is a greater tendency to go to excess in drinking than in taking opium.

Q.—How long have you been in Upper Burma ?

A.—For the last three years. Another thing I have noticed is this, almost all the prisoners admitted into the jail, after committing most of the violent crimes, have been in the habit of drinking spirits. Prisoners who have been admitted for petty thefts have been opium-eaters.

Q.—Except in this tendency to excess on the part of excessive consumers, have you noticed any other bad moral effects of the opium habit upon the character of these people ?

A.—No, I have not.

Q.—With regard to men of business and traders, do you think it interferes with their intellectual capacity to do their business ?

A.—No.

Q.—You say when opium is suddenly stopped, in the case of prisoners, you have noticed that they have diarrhœa, and complain of pains and aches all over the body ; is that the case also with moderate consumers, or is it the case only with excessive consumers ?

A.—Perceptible diarrhœa is apparent in even moderate consumers, but they do not leave off their food. I have to keep them on very light work. My remarks refer to those who go to excess. Morderate eaters or modcrate smokers do not leave off their food, nor do they complain so much of pains and aches all over the body. But they do get diarrhœa, that is general.

Q.—How long does the diarrhœa last ?

A.—It lasts two or three days. It is stopped by giving astringents.

Q.—During that time you have to give them light work ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—After that are they able to do the same work as the other people ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When they get out into the world from jail do they take to the habit again ?

A.—Yes. When they came back to jail I questioned them whether they went back to the opium habit after leaving jail, and they said "yes." I asked them why they took to it again. They said they felt happier and they did not feel the troubles and anxieties so much as before.

Q.—Do they generally recognise that it is a bad habit?

A.—Some do, and some do not. I have a prisoner now who says if he went out he could not devote his attention properly to his work unless he took opium. Others say they dislike it, but you cannot depend upon what they say. They know you do not like it, and they simply answer you so as to fall into your views.

Q.—In the case of excessive opium consumers, have you ever had to allow them for a time to take a certain amount?

A.—No. I have given them very small doses along with other astringents. About half a grain, or a grain, simply to help the action of the other astringents for diarrhœa.

Q.—In the case of habitual excessive alcohol consumers do they feel much craving for drink, when they cannot get it in jail?

A.—They do.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—Your experience has, I presume, been mostly among the Burmans?

A.—Amongst the Burmans latterly, but in the commencement of my life I had experience amongst the Natives of India.

Q.—Are there a considerable number of them who consume opium in Burma?

A.—I should say about ten per cent.

Q.—Adults?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Even now?

A.—Yes; it was not so much before, but it is increasing at present.

Q.—You have charge of jails: is there any hospital here?

A.—Yes; I am in charge of the Civil Hospital, too.

Q.—Have you noticed whether these Burmans often find their way into jail owing to the opium habit?

A.—Some find their way into jail through petty thefts.

Q.—When they get poor they commit petty thefts to get opium?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is that a more prominent feature amongst the poor who are opium smokers, than amongst the poor who are not opium smokers?

A.—No ; the thefts are quite as often amongst the poorer classes who do not use opium.

Q.—So that you do not think, even when they become poor, it aggravates matters for them in that respect ?

A.—It is very difficult to say. The difference must be very unappreciable.

Q.—You say they get thin when they take too much. Has your observation extended over a sufficient length of time in regard to the same individual, to enable you to form an opinion as to whether that emaciation is progressive ?

A.—It is progressive so long as they go on taking it.

Q.—Do you mean to say that a man who takes opium to excess get thinner and thinner to the end of the chapter ?

A.—If he stopped he would begin to put on flesh : it is not quite progressive.

Q.—I suppose the emaciation gets to a certain point and then stops?

A.—Yes ; that is so.

Q.—That is to say, they become spare, thin, wiry men ?

A.—That is what I mean.

Q.—They do not deteriorate mentally, though they become thinner ?

A.—They do not suffer mentally. As far as they are mentally concerned, they make better overseers than men who do not consume opium; but as far as their physical strength is concerned, lifting heavy loads and doing manual physical work, perhaps they would not be up to those who do not take it. Mentally, as far as supervising and comprehending instructions which are given, they are better than others who do not take opium.

Q.—They are sharper ?

A.—Yes, they are sharper.

Q.—Do you think that perhaps it is the sharper fellows who do take opium, and that it may be accounted for in that way ?

A.—It is a conclusion to draw from the number of cases. There is a greater percentage among the opium-eaters, who turn out to be very sharp.

Q.—Have you known old men who are opium-eaters or consumers amongst the Burmans ?

A.—Yes; I know a man now, a Jew, who is over seventy-five years of age; he is carrying one of the largest businesses going.

Q.—Does he smoke or eat ?

A.—He eats. I should say about three or four grains a day. He had to have his name registered, but he was rather ashamed of it. He was almost on the point of leaving Burma on account of the restriction, because he had to go and register his name in the Deputy Commissioner's Office. He said it was a great shame, and that he did not care to do it. He said that without taking it he could not carry on his business at all.

Q.—Have you had any experience amongst Chinese or people from the Shan States ?

A.—I have had no experience of the people from the Shan States. except those few Shans who have come into jail but I have had experience.

Q.—The Chinese smoke ; do not they ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it your experience that they do not suffer in body or mind?

A.—They do not.

Q.—How have they come before you as prisoners ?

A.—They have come before me in my private practice, and a few of them have come before me in jails.

Q.—I presume that you have seen deterioration of health, due to the excessive use of opium ?

A.—Yes, I have.

Q.—Apart from poverty, and apart from any associated disease, what symptoms would you bring home directly to the opium habit in excess ?

A.—The man's appetite fails, and the daily waste is not sufficiently replenished.

Q.—The emaciation becomes progressive ?

A.—Yes, to a certain extent, and in the same way proportionately with the general body waste, the organs waste, the viscera. I have not come across any specific *post-mortem* appearance, no pathological appearance, which I could attribute to opium, besides wasting.

Q.—But do you think that the opium habit carried to excess can itself kill, as far as you know ?

A.—I do not think it would kill.

Q.—But indirectly I presume it puts a man in peril. If a man eats or smokes opium to excess for a long time, I presume his life becomes precarious and more liable to other complaints ?

A.—If he does not take sufficient nourishment.

Q.—I want to isolate, as far as possible, the opium habit. Suppose a man has command of all the food he wishes to have, and supposing he is an excessive user of opium, does he put his life in peril?

A.—I do not think so.

Q.—Not from inherent disease?

A.—No; in fact it protects him to a certain extent from some of the diseases.

Q.—You mentioned opium as being a prophylactic. We know that there is no prophylactic against fever. You mean by that phrase that it assists and renders the attacks less frequent, or what do you mean?

A.—I am in charge of the Military Police, Sikhs and others, when they are transferred from one place to another. When they have to march through malarious districts I find that there is a smaller percentage who take disease among the opium-eaters that among non-opium eaters. I am speaking of fever and diarrhœa, and more especially when there is a change of water.

Q.—Some of the Sikhs do not use opium?

A.—Some do and others do not.

Q.—Both are Sikhs?

A.—Yes.

Q.—So that the comparison would be fair, because in one case opium was consumed, and in the other case opium was not?

A.—Among those who eat opium the percentage of sickness is smaller than among those who do not use it.

Q.—As far as your experience of Sikh soldiers goes, what is the amount of opium they consume, Have you any idea?

A.—Some of them consume from four annas' worth a day. About eight or ten grains. They take that in two doses.

Q.—Have you in your medical practice used opium as a drug in malarial conditions?

A.—Yes, with quinine very often, and I have found it answer better than increasing the dose of quinine alone.

Q.—You have practised in India as well as in Burma; has it struck you that the malarial troubles are different here from those you encounter in India, or are they the same?

A.—Nearly the same; I have not noticed any particular difference. In some districts it may be a matter of degree.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—You have had experience in England. Do you observe any difference in the effect produced by opium upon Europeans, Hindus, Chinamen, and Burmans?

A.—I cannot say that I have seen any at all among Europeans. Barring this tendency amongst the Burmans to go to excess, I have not noticed any difference in the effects on different races.

Q.—Although you say taken in moderation it makes the intellect clearer and enables men to do their work better, I also gather from your evidence that you do not advise people to commence the habit?

A.—No, I would not advise them to do so.

Q.—I think you made a remark to the effect that these people know that you do not like it, or some such expression as that?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You say that the Burmans do not take to excess when they have not sufficient money. I suppose from that you mean that they spend all the money they can over it?

A.—Proportionately speaking, if they have sufficient money to look after their wants they would go in for it; I do not think that they would deprive themselves of everything for the sake of opium.

Q.—Is it not the cause of a great deal of poverty?

A.—No, not in my experience.

Q.—But there are cases in which there is poverty which leads to petty thefts?

A.—Poverty in general leads to petty thefts.

Q.—Did I understand you to say that for moderate consumers who are in jail you prescribe light work?

A.—Yes, in the commencement.

Q.—Do you find a man who has often taken opium in moderation is so much unfit for his work that he cannot do it?

A.—For two or three days.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Is that when you have knocked his opium off?

A.—Yes. I knock it off entirely. When a man comes into jail, no matter how much he has been in the habit of taking opium, I knock it off at once.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—This case of the intellect being clearer is while the man remains under the influence of the dose?

A.—I mean to say when I am talking to prisoners who are opium consumers, their intelleet is elearer than others, even when they are not getting the drug. I can make better overseers from opium-eaters than I can from those who are non-opium eaters : not in every case, but there is a greater percentage.

Q.—When neither class are able to obtain opium ?

A.—Yes.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Are you in charge of the jail here now ?

A.—Yes ; I am in administrative charge, as well as medical charge. I have been in charge of these jails for the last thirteen years.

Q.—Where have you been in eharge of jails ?

A.—In Henzada in the Irrawaddy Division ; I have also been in Bassein, in the same Division, and in this jail in Mandalay.

Q.—You have been in Mandalay for the last three years ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I take it that the evidence you have given us to-day is the result of your experience in the jails of Burma, both Lower and Upper?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I did not quite understand whether you said you thought the number of Burman smokers in Upper Burma was on the increase ?

A.—Not in Upper Burma only, but in Burma generally, Lower and Upper.

Q.—Could you give us a percentage of what you think to be the number of opium-consuming Burmans in Upper Burma ?

A.—I should say about ten per cent in Lower Burma, and a little less in Upper Burma ; but I eannot give you any definite information.

Evidence of Mr. I. E. Bridges, C. S., Commissioner for the Eastern Division of Upper Burma.

In reply to the Chairman, the witness said :—I have been seventeen years in Burma. I was for three years doing ordinary magisterial work in the sub-division ; after that I was for nearly six years on settlement work ; and then I was for two years Revenue Seeretary. I eame up to Mandalay as Deputy Commissioner for one and a half years ; then I was Chief Seeretary for six months, next I was Deputy Commissioner again for five months, and then I was appointed Commissioner for three years. The number of Burmans who use opium in Upper Burma is exceedingly small. From enquiries I have made I think it is about one in five thousand. In Lower Burma the number is much larger.

Q.—Was opium used at all by the Lower Burmans before the annexation ?

A.—Yes, when there were Chinamen the Burmans used opium.

Q.—Are there many Shans in your district ?

A.—Not Shans proper : they are what are called Shan Danus. They are Shans who speak Burmese ; they are partly Burmanized. They live in the territory between Burma and the Shan States proper.

Q.—Was opium prohibited to these Shan Danus in the King's time ?

A.—It was nominally prohibited. But there was no real prohibition. They were allowed to go at it as much as they liked.

Q.—The prohibition was actually with regard to the Burmans proper ?

A.—I think I may say it was.

Q —But not very effectually ?

A.—Not very effectually ; they occasionally used to punish a man when they caught him, but many of them smoked who were never punished.

Q.—Does the same apply to liquor ?

A.—Yes ; only of course there were many more people who took liquor. A very large proportion of Upper Burmans took liquor when we came into the country. From what I heard I should think about seventy-five per cent of them took liquor : not always, but at times, at their Nat festivals. It was the usual practice in the King's time to allow liquor to be manufactured, and liquor was drunk freely. This Nat worship prevails a great deal in Upper Burma. It is their old religion, and they keep it alongside of Buddhism. They have temples to the Nats, a few miles north of Mandalay and in the pagodas at Pagan. They offer liquor to the figures. In all irrigation works when the water is let out, offerings are made in spirit to the Nats. In fact, the Burmans have asked me at Meiktila to allow them to manufacture liquor. But it is forbidden now and I told them they could not do it. In the King's time the liquor was manufactured from jaggery or palm-tree sugar and from rice. The stills were more or less concealed except at these Nat festivals, when it was done publicly. In Mandalay, in 1886, I saw a number of people drinking at these Nat festivals. On one occasion at the Amarapoora festival Nat festivals. On one occasion at the Amarapoora festival I saw three women drunk. I have never seen such a thing in Lower Burna ; these women pushed up against me in the road. As a rule, Burmese women keep out of the way. I asked the people what was the matter with them, and I was told that they were drunk.

Q.—Where did the opium come from that was obtained in those days?

A.—From Yunnan, from the Chinese in Mandalay. There was a large colony of Chinese in China Street. They were allowed to use opium. According to what the King's Ministers told me when we came into Mandalay, there were about 150 Burmans who used opium. That was their estimate of the number in Mandalay.

Q.—Did they smoke or eat the opium?

A.—Most of them ate it. They say only the richer people smoke it, as it is more expensive.

Q.—What we call the Shan States were tributary to the Kings of Burma, were they not?

A.—Yes, when we came in the King was trying to administer many of these territories. He had his ministers (Wuns) at the Courts of the Sawbwas. They had a Burmese military commander at Mobye. Burmese armies were constantly going through the Shan States, attacking the different people.

Q.—They did not interfere in internal administration much, I suppose?

A.—They levied *Thathameda* or income-tax. It is a kind of modified income-tax. It is fixed at ten rupees a house. If there are a hundred houses that means Rs. 1,000. It is divided according to the income of the different people.

Q.—The Chinese were openly allowed to have opium?

A.—Yes; Chinese and foreigners were allowed to continue their old custom, and to drink their liquor.

Q.—What is your opinion as to the effect of opium on Chinamen, as far as you have seen?

A.—The majority of Chinamen use opium and are not affected physically or morally by the use of the drug. They all work hard, and I have never seen a Chinaman in jail for an offence against the Indian Penal Code.

Q.—How does it affect the Burmese?

A.—I have seen opium smokers, but I cannot tell them from other people. I am unable to say that opium affects Burmans physically. In the jails in Lower Burma, the Burman opium-eaters or smokers whom I have seen did not appear inferior physically to non-opium smokers. Burmans are, however, strongly affected morally by the use of opium.

They become lazy, give up all work, and take to gambling and petty thieving. They do not commit any serious offences or crime on account of taking opium,

Q.—You say they take to gambling ?

A.—Burmans are naturally gamblers, and the opium-eaters and opium-smokers go in more for gambling.

Q.—I suppose the class that are criminals would naturally take to drinking and smoking ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—The poor man who spends more than he could afford in smoking and drinking would naturally take to petty thieving ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think there is any distinction in that respect between the man who spends more than he can afford in opium and the man who spends more than he can afford in liquor ?

A.—I do not think there is.

Q.—What is your opinion as to the effect of opium consumption amongst the Shans ?

A.—I am unable to say that there is any effect upon them. In 1887 I was up in the Shan States for three months. The Shans there were very hardy : they did long marches and carried heavy loads. From what I was told, many of them were either *ganja* smokers or opium smokers.

Q.—Does *ganja* consumption prevail in the Shan States ?

A.—Yes; they say it can be found almost in every village. It is grown, but it does not grow wild ; it is cultivated; they grow a few plants near the different houses.

Q.—Have you never asked the Shans why they took opium; have they give any reason for it ?

A.—No, I have not asked them.

Q.—A note has been put in here with regard to the Excise establishments present and proposed. I see that it says, "In addition to the regular Police the village Police, and, in Lower Burma, the Thuggis, the Revenue Collectors have duties in connection with the detection and suppression of offences against the opium law." How long has it been the case that the village Police police and Thuggis have had such duties ?

A.—I think for the last two or three years. No cases have been brought to light by them. The Burmans are very much afraid of giving

information against each other : they are afraid of revenge and people attacking them.

Q.—Are these village headmen paid by Government?

A.—They are paid by the *Thathamoda*,—the land revenue. They are generally hereditary men. The Thuggis, which is the Burman name for headmen in Upper Burma, have many villages under them, but the Ywathugyi has only one or two villages as a rule under him.

Q.—In 1892 a special form was prescribed for the appointment of these officials to be Excise officers, and on the back of those forms was written a short statement in popular language of their duties in connection with both liquor and opium?

A.—Yes; we have given those out to every man in the Burmese language.

Q.—I see they are given much larger powers under this form of appointment?

A.—Arresting, and seizing and searching houses : they have very small Magisterial powers. They can try petty thefts up to the value of Rs. 5. and small assault cases. They can fine up to Rs. 5.

Q.—Have you heard of any case in your division in which they have entered a house in search of opium?

A.—No; we have a special Excise establishment in my division. They do all this.

Q.—Are these Thuggis people who would be likely to abuse their powers?

A.—I think not: I think they are likely not to abuse them.

Q.—Do you think when the use of opium is prohibited except to non-Burmans, it is likely that smuggling will take place?

A.—I think a certain amount of smuggling will take place. We have smuggling now to a certain extent. The smuggling comes from the Shan States. We have seized opium in the Meiktila district and in the Kyaukse district; the opium in those cases came from the Southern Shan States.

Q.—Is the frontier of the Burmese districts and the Shan States a frontier where there are roads by which the hills can be crossed?

A.—No; there are a number of bye-paths. There are three large trading routes into the Eastern division, and there are a number of bye-

paths that go off the roads, and you can get down into the plains at different places. These bye-paths are only passable by men on foot.

Q.—So that smuggling in small quantities would be hard to stop ?

A.—It would be very hard to stop.

Q.—I suppose one man might carry a great deal of opium ?

A.—Yes, he could carry several *viss* of opium without any difficulty.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—You say the number of Upper Burmans who use opium is exceedingly small, being only about one in five thousand. Do you mean one in five thousand of the total population ?

A.—Yes ; that is from enquiries I have made.

Q.—That would only mean about one in twelve hundred, or one in a thousand adults ?

A.—Yes.

By Mr. Pease. Q.—In your report which was given in on the 21st of January, 1892, you say that out of 104 men in four villages the health and capacity of the majority had been affected by the use of the drug. Is that your experience generally ?

A.—No ; that is taken from the reports of the Deputy Commissioner.

Q.—Do you think it a fair statement to make that the majority who take opium have no capacity for work?

A.—From my own personal experience I cannot say that they are affected. This is the opinion of the Deputy Commissioner, whose report I was sending on ; I made no enquiries myself.

Q.—You further say nearly all have been affected by the use of the drug, and several have taken to crime ?

A.—That is petty crime.

Q.—Do you think that probably that was rather an exaggerated statement ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—You also say " opium consumers are said to be of weak physique and to live on the earnings of their wives." Do you think that is an exaggeration ?

A.—No.

Q.—You say " I do not think that we can expect any co-operation from the people themselves in putting down the opium traffic :" during

the time of the King considerable assistance was obtained in the matter, was it not, from the heads of the Buddhist church ?

A.—I never heard of it.

Q.—It was so stated in evidence in London ?

A.—Religiously all Burmans in theory are against both drink and opium ; and the King repeatedly issued orders forbidding both drink and opium. That was only theory : the practice was quite different.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—That was more in the shape of pious opinion ?

A.—Yes ; King Mindon Min constantly issued orders against drink and opium.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Mr. Adams in giving evidence said, "The Buddhist Archbishop of the day (1876) showed me despatches in cipher which he was then sending to the Court at Mandalay, addressed personally to the King, detailing cases which had taken place, and various crimes committed and the punishments inflicted by the Civil authorities. They always acted as spies upon the doings of the people, and anything contrary to Buddhist law, apart from the national law, was at once reported, and the priests themselves accused people to the Civil authorities."

A.—All the older Burmans are using their opinion against it undoubtedly. When children take to the use of opium they reprove them and tell them not to.

Q.—You say also "I am of opinion that the prohibition of the use of opium by Burmans in Upper Burma has been effectual." Is that your view at the present time ?

A.—I may qualify that a little by saying, except where there are a number of Chinese. Where the number of Chinese has increased, there they have introduced opium, that is, in larger towns.

Q.—Do you think there will be any disposition on the part of the Shan Chiefs to co-operate in any movement for stopping the growth of the poppy in their States ?

A.—I think not : they may say they will, but they will not, I think.

Q.—Do you think the consumption of opium in the Shan States is larger in the neighbourhood of the caravan routes, than it is in the other parts of the country ?

A.—All that I can say is that there is less consumption in the Southern Shan States than in the Northern Shan States, because opium is not grown in any quantity there : they consume *ganja*.

Q.—The caravan routes are through the Southern portion ?

A.—Both; the route to Yunnan is through the Northern Shan States.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—You are aware that your view, that prohibition has been effectual in Upper Burma, is contrary to the opinions which have often been quoted from the Excise Report of 1890-91 to the effect that prohibition with regard to liquor and opium were nugatory ?

A.—With regard to liquor I do not think it has been effectual ; but I think it has with regard to opium.

Q.—Is it not the case that the rules themselves have been better since the Excise Report of 1890-91 was written, making not sale, but also possession punishable ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Do you think that has tended in any way to make the rules better enforced and more effectual ?

A.—I cannot say I think so. I think it is simply keeping opium away from them that prevents them taking to it. We have very few shops, and they have very little opportunity of getting it. There are three shops in the Eastern Division.

Q.—Are those three shops supposed to be supplied exclusively with Government opium ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—I suppose there is no restriction to selling in licensed shops opium that is imported so long as duty is paid ?

A.—No, and confiscated opium is sent to them for sale.

Q.—So that in fact the preventive system which you now have to keep up in the Eastern District on the Shan frontier is intended not to prohibit the entry altogether, but to see that the opium which comes over is, as far as possible, made to pay duty ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—If opium were totally prohibited and the shops were closed, would you then have to keep a much larger preventive force ?

A.—Yes, we should have to keep a much larger preventive force. All the Chinamen would leave the country, and our Military Police could not stay here. The Chinese are the chief traders in the Eastern Division. They have nearly all the kutch trade in their hands. They have also some timber trade and all the cotton trade.

Q.—I may take it as your opinion, as responsible for the division, that you do not wish to see any further restriction than those contained in the regulations recently put forth ?

A.—No. I do not.

Q.—By the Chairman.—Is Yunnan or Shan opium readily distinguishable from Government opium ?

A.—Yes. I do not myself know what the difference is.

Evidence of Mr. Law Yan, K. S. N., given through an interpreter.

By the Chairman.—Q.—I am a merchant and Municipal Commissioner at Mandalay. I have lived in Mandalay for over thirty years. Not more than one in ten of the Yunnanese in Mandalay smoke opium, and few of the better class of merchants. The Fokinese and Cantonese smoke it to great extent, but not universally. In the time of King Mindon Min the restrictions on the sale of opium were less stringently enforced than at present. I think it a bad thing to smoke opium. It is against the traditional precepts of my people, and it is also bad for the smoker's health. Most Kachins smoke opium, and as they live in a cold climate they are not so much affected by the practice as people who live in a hot climate. I have been Municipal Commissioner since 1888, and am the only Yunannese merchant who is Municipal Commissioner. I was born in Yunnan. I am forty-eight, and I have been here thirty-one years, having come in the time of King Mindon Min. I have never been back to Yunnan. All my people have died, and I have never gone back there.

Q.—Have you ever tried smoking opium ?

A.—No, I have never tried it. I do not like it. My grandfather told me not to smoke it. We have never smoked it in our family.

Q.—Does it commonly run in families to smoke or not to smoke, as the case may be ?

A.—I think there is about fifty per cent who have not smoked from father to son.

Q.—Do you think there is any difference in cleverness between the merchants who smoke and those who do not smoke ?

A.—I think it is the same thing whether a man smokes or not.

Q.—In commercial honesty do you thing there is any difference ?

A.—They are indolent in mind—the people who smoke opium. I do not think there is any difference in their honesty : some are good and some are bad.

Q.—In King Mindon Min's time was there any restriction on the Chinese using opium ?

A.—All that the King used to issue orders about was not to sell opium to the Burmans, but the next day the Chinese would be selling to the Burmans. It was enforced one day, and in a few days it was forgotten. The Burmans smoke less now than they did in the Burmese times.

Q.—I suppose the Burmese only smoked in places like Mandalay ?

A.—They also smoked in the jungle, in the district outside Mandalay.

Q.—Do you know of any opium-smokers who have died from smoking opium ?

A.—I have heard of men dying because they could not buy any opium and they had been in the habit of taking it ; they died of dysentery or diarrhœa when the opium was stopped.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—There are three classes of Chinese,—Yunnanese, Fokinese, and Cantonese,—in Mandalay ?

A.—Three-tenths Yunnanese and seven-tenths Cantonese and Fokinese.

Q.—Would you be in favour of anything being done to prevent those smoking who have not yet begun to do so ?

A.—It would be better to prevent opium-smoking amongst those who have not yet begun.

Q.—Would you be in favour of a register being made for present smokers, and that all others should be prevented from buying opium ?

A.—If people stay here for good it will be advisable to have the names of smokers registered ; if they are only temporary persons who go about here and there, it would not be advisable to register them. It is in the discretion of the Government whether it would be advisable to have their names registered or not.

Q.—Is that opinion the opinion of the Chinese generally: would the the Chinese people agree with you in that ?

A.—The confirmed smokers will not like having their names registered unless those who do not smoke and do not eat opium like the registration of the smokers' names: the smokers would not like it.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—In the days of King Mindon Min, where did the opium come from that the people smoked ?

A.—From the Shan States, from the north, and from Bhamo. Yunnanese opium came from the Northern Shan States and from Bhamo.

By the Chairman.—Q.—When you lived in Yunnan as a young man was the poppy much cultivated there?

A.—The poppy was not grown much in the Yunnan country. There are wild tribes in a great part of Yunnan.

Evidence of Mr. Sidney Jennings, Inspector of Police.

By the Chairman.—I joined the Burma Police in May, 1888. I served in the Thongwa district for about a year. In September, 1889, I was transferred to Carmein, the most northern British post in Burma.

Q.—What people live in that district?

A.—The Kachins.

Q.—Are those Kachins independent?

A.—They have drawn a line.

Q.—I suppose those inside that line are under our Administration, and we only have political relations with those outside that line?

A.—Yes; there is no distinction between the Kachins inside the line and those outside the line in character or in habits? About eighty per cent of them smoke opium.

Q.—Do you know if they eat opium at all, or do they only smoke?

A.—They eat opium, but they are not looked upon very highly if they do so. It is at night when they have finished their work that they bring out their opium pipes. The man who eats opium does it on the quiet.

Q.—He is not thought a good fellow?

A.—No.

Q.—What do you think they take to it for?

A.—They have very hard work all day. They are up at daybreak and work until nightfall. They have no leisure of any kind, and they have very bad food. Originally they copied the Chinese; and since the habit has been established, they cannot do without it: when they have no opium they at once go sick.

Q.—You mean the men who have acquired the habit?

A.—Yes.

Q.—They go sick in what way?

A.—They get fever and dysentery; many of them die if they do not get it. Being a Police officer I have had several men in the lock-up who, as they got no opium, at once went sick. One of them died in Mandalay because he could not get opium.

Q.—Do they suppose it is a preventive against disease?

A.—They always say so. They say at once, "I shall get sick if you do not give it to me." I do not fancy they think much about it one way or the other.

Q.—Beyond this liability to fall sick if they do not get it, do you know of any other bad results of the opium upon them ?

A.—No, I do not.

Q.—I suppose some use it to excess ?

A.—Very few. The Kachins are not very rich, and they cannot afford to buy it in large quantities.

Q.—Is the habit confined to the men ?

A.—No, the women smoke also. Not as much as the men ; about twenty per cent smoke on the Carmein side, where I am ; on the Myitkyina side a good many women smoke.

Q.—Do they grow much opium in that country ?

A.—On the Myitkyina side they do, and down by Endau Lake. They do not grow enough for their own consumption.

Q.—Where do they get it from ?

A.—It crosses the confluence of the Mlikha and the Mikha. It is brought by the Chinese caravans. A good many Kachins cross the border and bring it over for themselves. I have myself met Kachins coming ever, and have searched them and found opium, in balls.

The few cases of excess are chiefly among the rich men ; they never do any work, and they keep to their houses. There is no real bad effect ; but the men are not very strong.

Q.—Would it be possible to stop the opium coming over ?

A.—Not at present. The force up there is quite incapable of dealing with it. There is over a hundred miles of Chinese boundary, and opium is grown just over the border. There are no roads ; it is dense jungle. The Kachin paths are very numerous. It is quite impossible to deal with it now.

Q.—How do you think the Kachins would like it if any measures were taken to stop it ?

A.—They would not like it at all.

Q.—Do not they admit in talking that it is a bad thing ?

A.—No, they do not.

Q.—What is their religion ?

A.—They worship Nats.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Are your Police Military or Civil Police?

A.—There is only one Civil Policeman in Carmein, the rest are Military Police ; they are called Ghurkas, but they are really Assamese.

Q.—Are they opium consumers ?

A.—I have not noticed it amongst them. There is nowhere where they could get it. There is only one shop at Mogaung.

Q.—Could they not buy it from the Kachins who grow it?

A.—Yes, they could ; but the Kachins will not bring it into Kamein. My district is called the Mogaung sub-division. There are three sub-divisions in the Bhamo district—Mogaung, Myitkyina and Shwegu.

Q.—Have you one of those three?

A.—I had when I first went up; then I was sent to Kamein as a sort of Civil Officer.

By the Chairman.—Q.—Is Kamein in Mogaung?

A.—It is in the sub-division : it is north of Mogaung. My district goes up to the Jade mines.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—What class of people work in the Jade mines?

A.—They come from Mandalay. There are Chinamen. Kachins, and Kadus.

Q.—Do you know anything about the consumption of opium among the people working in the Jade mines?

A.—No, merely from rumour. Last year 10,000 *viss* were supposed to have been brought to the mines. There was a shop of the Jade mines two years ago, there is not now.

By the Chairman.—Q.—The Kadus are a small tribe living up in that part.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—How far is your district from here ?

Q.—It takes three days by steamer from here to Bhamo, and from Bhamo it takes five days by boat.

Q.—You said the death-rate would be enormous if the use of opium were prohibited : we have had a great deal of evidence to show that persons in jail and other places, though they suffer for a while, have not been permanently affected by it; can you tell us what has brought you to that conclusion?

A.—The men that I have had in the lock-up have invariably gone sick, and two of them have died from not having opium.

Q—Under medical attention?

A.—No, there is only an Assistant Apothecary up there.

Q.—You come to your conclusion rather from your general experience than from statistics?

A.—It is not extensive, because not many Kachins are locked up. It is the prevailing belief amongst themselves that they will die.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—I believe there is only one shop in your district?

A.—At present there is one at Mogaung.

Q.—The opium that comes from China comes in the crude state?

A.—Yes.

Q.—It is not the smoking extract?

A.—No.

Q.—Would that be made in the shop; they boil it there?

A.—Yes.

By the Chairman.—Q.—The Kachin country is a very malarious country; and the district of the Jade mines also.

Q.—Are the people allowed to get opium there?

A.—They are not allowed but we cannot stop it. If we could stop it, they would not be allowed to get it.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—Amongst the Kachins I suppose the adult males smoke opium the most?

A.—Yes, about eighty per cent.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Are the Police responsible for carrying out these Excise laws?

A.—Yes.

Q.—When you say you cannot stop these people in the Jade mines, what efforts do you make?

A.—The force up there is insufficient. Whenever we meet a caravan or anything of the sort we search it, and when we find opium it is confiscated. There are many small roads, and the jungles are so dense that nobody knows anything about them except the Kachins, and it is impossible to get at them.

Q.—If any of your men find the people at the Jade mines using opium, do they investigate where the opium came from?

A.—There is no Civil police up there; we have not got as far as that yet.

By the Chairman.—Q.—Are your police Sikhs or what?

A.—They are called Gurkhas, but there are really very few Gurkhas amongst them, the majority are Assamese.

Q.—Do they consume opium?

A.—No, I have never noticed it. I have never seen them smoking; if they eat it they eat it on the quiet.

Q.—I believe that two Yunnanese have come in from Bhamo to give evidence?

A.—Yes.

Q.—How did they come forward to give evidence?

A.—They came from Bhamo. As I came down, the Deputy Commissioner told me to bring them with me; beyond that I know nothing about them.

Evidence of Haji Shahshuddin, (examined through an interpreter).

By the Chairman.—I am a Panthé merchant. I have lived in Burma for twenty years and in Mandalay since the occupation. Panthés are forbidden to smoke opium and as a rule do not smoke. Panthés who do smoke are men of rank. As regards the effect of opium on the health of the consumer, well-fed persons may smoke opium without ill-effects; whereas ill-nourished persons are harmed by it. About half the Yunnanese in Burma or in Yunnan smoke opium. Men of substance and position among the Yunnanese smoke opium; but there is some slight loss of reputation attached to the practice. The social stigma, such as it is, is slight. Very few Chinese eat opium, the majority of consumers smoke it. In the King's time opium was openly sold, without prohibition, by Chinese to Chinese. It was also sold secretly to Burmans. I have been to the Kachin country. There half the Kachins smoke opium and are strong and healthy. I do not think they smoke to excess. I have heard that opium-smoking keeps off fever; but I do not know whether this is really the case.

Q.—Where was your home originally?

A.—South of Tali-fu. There are many Chinese and Mahommedans in that part of the country. I left Yunnan after the rebellion. First I went to live in Rangoon and then from Rangoon I came to live in Mandalay. I was in Upper Burma, in the King's time. I had my residence in Rangoon, but I came here to trade. I sometimes stayed here eight months and I went back and got married. I was permanently here during the whole of King Thibaw's reign.

Q.—You say that the Panthés are forbidden to smoke opium : is that a religious rule ?

A.—The Panthé religion forbids the smoking of opium.

Q.—Panthés are Mahommedans, are they not ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Amongst the Mahommedans of India and Persia opium is not supposed to be forbidden ; how is it that it is forbidden amongst the Panthés ?

A.—They think it is forbidden in the Koran. It is a religious injunction with them.

Q.—When you were in Yunnan was there any poppy cultivation ?

A.—Yes, I saw a great deal grown in my own town.

Q.—Was not the cultivation of the poppy supposed to be forbidden by the order of the Emperor of China in those days ?

A.—I heard once that the Emperor of China prohibited the cultivation of the poppy. I heard that in my ehildhood ; but ever since I have known the country it has been cultivated freely.

Q.—You say that some Panthé men of rank do smoke : I suppose those are people who have no work to do ?

A.—I heard that when there were Panthe Princes, they used to smoke opium : but I do not know it of my own knowledge.

Evidence of Mr. Yang Fu and Mr. San Tu examined through an interpreter.

In reply to the Chairman, Mr. Yang Fu said he was a Yunnanese of Bhamo, and had been in Burma for over ten years. He lived before that in Moulmein and in Yunnan. He was not a Buddhist ; he worshipped Chinese gods, and was a Confucian. He had smoked opium thirty-two years, and smoked about half a tieal of opium a day,—eight annas' weight. He took to it becausc he was suffering from sickness on aecount of fever.

Q.—Do you think it stops fever ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it the general opinion that opium is good for stopping fever ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—If opium were stopped what would be the result ?

A.—The men who could not stop the practice would go back to the Chinese country, and others would suffer the orders of the Government.

Q.—Of the Yunnanese who trade between China, how many smoke and how many do not smoke ?

A.—More than half.

Q.—How is it that you come forward to give evidence ?

A.—The Deputy Commissioner called us.

Q.—Was a meeting called, or did the Deputy Commissioner call you individually ?

A.—The Deputy Commissioner assembled the Chinese and told them the Government wanted them to send some Chinese gentlemen to represent them here. The Chinese chose six who went up to the Deputy Commissioner ; and out of those six two were chosen ; we two were chosen and we have been sent down.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—How many Yunnanese are there in Bhamo —permanent residents ?

A.—About five or six hundred.

Q.—Are there many who come and go ?

A.—Yes: more than a thousand people come down in the cold weather.

Q.—If the Government said that no Yunnanese should have opium unless their names were upon a list, do you think it would be possible to carry that out in Bhamo ?

A.—If I could not stand the order, I would go back to my country ; I would think about it.

Q.—Do you think if these temporary people who go to and fro trading were not allowed to have opium that it would stop their coming to trade ?

A.—Only the people who do not smoke would come : all the opium smokers would stay at home.

Q.—What do the people generally trade in ?

A.—From Yunnan they bring cloths, silk, cotton, food, fruits, walnuts, apples, pears, and they also bring salt pork. They take back amber, jade, and lac.

By Mr. Pease.—Q.—Would you advise a young man in good health to take opium ?

A.—No, I would not advise any young man to smoke opium.

Q.—Have you ever given up taking it yourself, and if so, for how long ?

A.—I have stopped opium five or six times, and on one occasion I stopped it for one year. Sometimes I stop it for two or three months, and other times for five or six months.

Mr. San Tu in reply to the Chairman, said that he had smoked opium for fifteen years. He smoked ten or twelve annas' weight of opium daily. He had been settled in Bhamo for three years.

Q.—Is there much poppy cultivated about your home in Yunnan?

A.—Poppy is grown on the hills. I have not seen the poppy cultivation, but I have heard that it is grown. It is only grown on the hills. I come from a village.

Q.—In other respects do you agree with the evidence given by Mr. Yang Fu?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Mr. Yang Fu said he would not advise a young man who had not taken opium to take opium; but supposing the young man had to go the Jade mines or to go to a feverish place, would you then advise him to take opium pills, or to take opium in any shape or not?

A.—It would not concern me if a young man went to the Jade mines. I would not say anything. They could smoke if they liked. I would not like if my son smoked.

Evidence of Rev. M. B. Kikrpatrick, M.D.

By the Chairman.—I belong to the American Baptist Mission, and am a Medical Missionary.

Q.—How long have you been in Burma, and in what districts have you been?

A.—I was in Toungoo for two years; I have been living up in the Shan States for three years, and much of my time has been spent travelling in the Shan country. It is five years and six months since I came to Burma. For ten years before I came here I was practising in Philadelphia in Medical Mission work.

Q.—Will you give us an account of your experience in Toungoo?

A.—Daily when living in Toungoo, in Lower Burma, I was interested in investigating the effects of opium-smoking on those who freely indulged in the drug. I visited some opium farms, as they are called, early in the evening, but I saw little of the drug consumed on the place. Many were buying in small quantities, to be used at home. One day the Inspector of Police told me that about midnight he was going to visit some dens to find a notorious thief who had just come to town. He asked me if I should like to see some of their work, and I told him

I should be very glad to do so. We spent two or three hours in visiting several of these miserable dens. He found not only the man he wanted, but two other bad characters. He arrested the three men that night.

Q.—What are these dens as you call them ?

A.—They are licensed opium farms. A signboard is in front. saying Opium Farm, number so and so.

Q—Is Toungoo a big town ?

A.—There are about fifteen or twenty thousand inhabitants.

Q.—How many licensed shops do you suppose then are there ?

A.—I think there were three on China Street at that time. Several that we visited that night and on subsequent occasions were not licensed ; they were illicit places. The Police knew them very well. The Police told me at that time that if they wanted bad characters they always looked first for them in the opium dens. In one place I saw about a hundred men and a few women taking the drug. Some were sleeping in a dull stupor, others were quietly smoking, and some were groaning with pain because they could not get the drug. There were several people about asking for pice. Several were outside and inside, and when they saw a white man they begged for pice that they might have a smoke. Those who had been several years taking the drug were in nearly every case thin in flesh, emaciated and nervous and haggard-looking. Those who had only recently acquired the habit, of course, were in a better condition. During the two years I was living in Toungoo I often made these late nocturnal visits and saw many physical as well as moral wrecks in these places. Many Burmans were pointed out to me as at one time holding positions of honour and responsibility, but becoming opium-smokers they had lost everything and were then miserable beggars, asking for a few pice that they might indulge in another smoke. Several men were pointed out to me as having been once clerks in the Courts or attached to the Deputy Commissioner's Office, and several men who had held important positions at some time or another were pointed out to me.

Q.—I suppose your knowledge of the number of licensed places at that time was very vague, was it not ?

A.—It was simply from observation. I have seen the placards on the places.

Q.—There are now twenty retail licensed shops in all Lower Burma, and there were in the time you mention, 1888-89, only sixteen

in all Lower Burma: so there could hardly have been two in Toungoo; at the present moment there is only one?

A.—I am sure from the placards I saw that there were two immediately opposite the Burman Chapel. Two of those placards were up "Opium farms." I visited several places with the Police on the night I have mentioned, but how many of them were licensed I could not say.

Q.—You say that in one place you saw about a hundred men in the place. Was that a licensed shop?

A.—That was a licensed shop. It was immediately opposite the Burman Chapel, where we had services nearly every day in the week. We did not go into the other place that night where the placard was. I think it was in the adjoining building next door.

Q.—How many of those hundred people do you think were Burmese and how many Chinese?

A.—There were very few Chinese. I could not say how many; they were mostly Burmese.

Q.—How many Indians were there?

A.—There were some Natives of India: I do not remember seeing any Chinamen except those connected with the place. There were fifteen or twenty of them playing dominoes or some thing of the sort, but I do not remember seeing a single Chinaman actually smoking.

Q.—You say that some people were groaning. How many people were groaning? Do you recollect whether it was one man, or do you distinctly recollect seeing several groaning?

A.—Several.

Q.—How do you know they were groaning for want of opium? Might they not be suffering from some complaint?

A.—I asked the Inspector of Police, and he told me they were groaning because of having pains; they said they hadn't opium enough and they hadn't any pice. They had terrible pains and they could not get any opium.

Q.—You mean the gnawing pain which the habitual opium consumer has?

A.—Yes, that is what I inferred. I did not know the Burmese language very well; in fact, I do not know it now very well. This is what the Inspector of Police told me; he asked the question for me. The Inspector's name was Young. I think he is up in the Karen station now.

Q.—Are Karens common in the Toungoo District?

A.—There are a good many Karens.

Q.—Do they smoke much?

A.—No; I have never seen any of them who were addicted to the habit.

Q.—They are much addicted to drinking, are they not? Are they put under discipline when they become converts, to prevent them drinking?

A.—Certainly. They are immediately dismissed from the fellowship of the Church if they are known to get drunk. I was never connected with the Karen district; but I have travelled with some missionaries and know it to be a fact that if a man is known to be drunk once, he is excluded from the Church. It is absolutely forbidden.

Q.—You have travelled in the Shan States?

A.—Yes, for four years. I have been in almost all the Shan States, east and west of the Salween. I have not been across the Salween. I have been through the Southern Shan States and in nearly all of the Northern Shan States.

Q.—The people of the Shan States are great consumers of opium, are they not?

A.—My experience is that they are not, especially in the middle of the Southern Shan States, except on the caravan routes and the main routes like this road running from Yunnan and Thibaw and the road from Meiktila to Fort Stedman and Mone and the Soutnern Shan States.

Q.—I believe there are some parts of the Southern Shan States where opium is largely cultivated?

A.—Further north and east: it is in the Chinese quarters.

Q.—Have you been in these quarters?

A.—I have never travelled in that part of the country. I have never seen any large poppy fields: I have seen small patches of the plant which were more for ornament. I have never seen it cultivated for commercial purposes or use: never in any of the places I have travelled.

Q.—You say small patches: what size?

A.—There would just be a few plants for the garden where the people would have their mustard leaves and a few flowers around their houses.

Q.—You know that it is largely cultivated in some districts?

A.—Yes, in certain districts ; but, as far as I know, it is more north than east. There is not much raised in the Thibaw district and in the south at Theinni. It is not much cultivated, as far as I know. I have passed through at different times, and I have never seen it cultivated. I know they have opium for sale there, but it is not cultivated commercially.

Q.—Your remark that it is mostly used near the caravan routes refers to that part of the country where there is no opium grown ?

A.—It refers to those who are going and coming on this main line of travel. In the jungle villages a little is used. The further you come this way, the more it is used. Much more is used now than was used four years ago when I first come over the road.

Q.—How can you tell that ?

A.—I judge that from the number of coolies who smoke. When I first came, out of thirty or forty coolies, only two or three would be opium-smokers. I carefully avoided the opium-smokers. The last time I came from Moymyo I told my Shan man to avoid any opium-smokers. Out of forty or fifty men he selected twenty, and the first night I found sixteen of them smoking opium.

Q.—We know that opium has long been grown in the Shan States and in Yunnan, and that even in King Mindon Min's time its use was not prohibited, as far as Chinese or Shans were concerned. Have you tany reason to give why the custom should be growing ?

A.—I only know what the people say: they say they learn it in Mandalay. They bring goods down here to sell and they get into the habit.

Q.—Do you think that is probable ?

A.—I think so ; certainly it is the case in Thibaw.—When I went here four years ago there were very few opium-smokers in the place. The Thibaw Sawbwa told me when I was there, that amongst his own people in Thibaw there were very few who take opium, although I found it common amongst the coolies. He regrets very much that it has come into the place ; it has given great trouble.

Q.—Do many of these coolies you mention come into Mandalay from the Shan States ?

A —Yes, a good many of them. They come on the road, carrying their loads with them. They are petty traders. Some carry loads for others. They get the leaves for making the cheroots and various things up there, and bring them down to sell. They take back other goods in

exchange and sell them on the road. You see hundreds of them in the course of a day's journey coming and going, especially during the rains.

Now, in the cold weather, when carts can go, there are comparatively few of them: they are harvesting in the paddy fields and doing other work; but during the rains great quantities of them are going and coming.

Q.—Is it more likely that the custom should spread into the Shan States from one or two licensed vendors in Upper Burma rather than from the people of the Shan States and of Yunnan, who have been smoking for a long time and in large numbers?

A.—In Thibaw and those adjacent places where, I know, the habit is spinging up it comes from the Chinamen who send their agents down here. I think it is at least eighteen months or two years since they had a licensed shop in Maymyo.

Q.—Which opium is mostly consumed in Shan States—Shan or Yunnan opium?

A.—Crude opium comes down from China. The Chinese traders bring it down and sell it. These men come with their pack ponies and mules, and bring nuts and fruits and opium down. They sell the crude opium. In Thibaw I have seen them preparing the opium which is smoked. The Chinamen have agents down here who take it up there.

The witness was cross examined at some length on this subject; it was pointed out to him that opium from Mandalay having paid a heavy duty to Government and the farmer's profit must be much dearer than Native Shan opium. But he adhered to his statement, saying that he knew one man who takes frequent trips to get the opium, to Mandalay and that at Thibaw he had seen Chinamen bringing the opium down, and cooking it there. The Sawbwa of Thibaw had lately given a license but the licenses failed to make it a success.

Q.—In your hospital work have you seen anything of opium consumers?

A.—Yes, a great many cases are coming there now. Last year I had more than I have had recently, because the Myosa of Ngokele came down with a large party of about 400 followers. He came down here on the border between Burma and the Shan country, just outside the Burmese district. His followers were largely Burmese; he calls himself a Shan. His followers are nearly all opium-smokers. and I had a great many of them coming for treatment. When he was there I had four times as many smokers coming to the hospital as I have now.

Q.—What did they come to the hospital for?

A.—They came for various diseases and troubles. A good many came for medicine to cure them of the opium habit. They were slaves to the habit and they wanted to break themselves of it, and so they came for medicine. They heard that the white man had medicine which could make them sick of opium and loathe the habit.

Q.—How did you treat them ?

A.—With those who came and took regular treatment, I stopped the opium gradually, gave them tonics and good food and kept them away from opium. Several of them kept from it for several months, and some have kept from it for eighteen months ; not having touched it all, at least that is what they say. and I have every reason to think that their statement is true. Others would come there and take medicine and tonics for a few days, and when they got a craving for opium, they would smoke just a little and then they would give way and smoke just as bad as ever. Unless they are taken from their surroundings, it is almost impossible for them to give up the habit.

Q.—Do you think opium-smoking has any effect, physically or morally, when taken in moderation ?

A.—That would depend largely upon what you mean by moderation. Some men can smoke a comparatively large quantity, whilst a small quantity will almost destroy others.

Q.—Do you think it ends in destroying life ?

A.—I have no doubt that it is the principal cause of death in many cases.

Q.—By making them more susceptible to other diseases, or how.

A.—I think it is directly due to the use of opium in many cases. I have had numerous cases come to the hospital : they complain of dysentery. Some of them have had it for six months. I ask them whether they are opium-smokers. Sometimes they deny it, but usually they will say, "yes." I ask them how much they smoke, and they say they smoke ten annas' worth, or as much as they can get ; that is generally their answer. I find dysentery very common among excessive opium-smokers, and I have known many of them to die from it. I do not know any other cause for it. They eat very little food.

Q.—I suppose dysentery is a very common disease in the country, is it not ?

A.—Yes, at certain seasons. Some years there is a good deal of it, and some years there is very little.

Q.—Do you think that this is a special form?

A.—I think so. It occurs at any time of the year and without any exciting cause, as far as I am able to determine.

Q.—Is the country very malarious ?

A.—Yes, all this part of the Shan country is malarious.

Q.—I suppose many of the people are soaked full of malaria ?

A.—Yes. Take, for instance, Thibaw city. Two-thirds of the people in that city have malarious fever during the rains ; it is very common. The rule is to have fever ; every one expects to have more or less fever during the rains.

Q.—Do people take opium to relieve them of the fever.

A.—Amongst the Shans I have never known it to be done, but I have known it in Toungoo. I have asked Burmans why they used opium, and they gave that as an excuse. They said they had fever, and they took it to relieve the pains. They then get into the habit of it and cannot stop it. Opium is an anodyne : they say they have the fever just the same, but it relieves the pain.

Q.—You do not think there is any idea in the country that it is a protection against fever ?

A.—It is only within the last few months that I have heard of it. I never heard it advanced by a Native.

Q.—I heard of it thirty years ago from the Natives of India.

A.—I have only had experience during the five years I have been here.

Q.—You never heard of it before ?

A.—I first heard of it from those people in Toungoo who came to the hospital. I also heard it from the people I saw in the opium places there and the coolies and others who, I knew, were opium-smokers. It is an excuse frequently made by those who use opium. I have never heard from a Native that it is used as a prophylactic : it is simply to relieve the pains when they have the fever.

Q.—They are not in the habit of taking prophylatics of any kind, I suppose ?

A.—Many of them have come to me saying, "I may be sick and I want something that will keep it from me." They want something to keep them from sickness.

Q.—What are your views about the prohibition of opium ?

A.—I think it would be very desirable to prevent its being consumed except for medicinal purposes.

Q.—You think prohibition should apply to all classes ?

A.—I think so certainly. It would prevent others from acquiring the habit. Perhaps an exception might be made with the habitual opium-smokers. Of course it would be a great hardship to those who are thoroughly accustomed to it to break it off suddenly; still, I believe in most cases it would be a benefit. I have seen cases in jails and hospitals ; there is no question that they suffer and that the craving is very great, but I have never known any bad results come from breaking it off suddenly when they had proper care and treatment.

Q.—Is it not difficult to draw the line between medical use and the use for mere pleasure and comfort ?

A.—I think it would be safe to leave that to the physicians.

Q.—Your exception would be when a man gets a medical prescription ?

A.—I think that would be very safe.

Q.—Is that what you mean—is that how you would draw the line ?

A.—Yes, I think so. A man should have a prescription or it could be done as it is in America, and, as I understand, it is in England ; only those who are apothecaries should sell the drug ?

Q.—I do not know what the rules are in America, but in England there is nothing to prevent a druggist or an apothecary from selling to anybody who asks for the drug ?

A.—I thought there was.

Q.—Do you know what the rule is in America ?

A.—Druggists are not supposed to dispense it except in the case of a physician's prescription. Take for instance, the tincture Opii. They give small quantities, or paregoric. The law prohibits it ; yet they do dispense it.

Q.—I have heard that opium-eating is very common in some parts of the Southern States of America ?

A.—I have never lived in the Southern States ; but I know in our large cities the use of morphia is increasing and also the smoking of opium.

Q.—Is that among Native-born Americans ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—There are no druggists or apothecaries in this country, except perhaps in towns like Mandalay, are there?

A.—As far as I know, there are no shops of that kind. Almost always the medicines are dispensed through the hospital, through the Civil Surgeon.

Q.—Hospitals and dispensaries are only in a few places?

A.—They are in the larger towns and larger stations.

Q.—They would hardly be able to supply the villages, would they? If a person could only get opium for medical purposes by going to a town, it would not be a satisfactory arrangement: he would sometimes have a very long distance to travel?

A.—There is almost always some medical man, either a representative of Government, or someone else practising as a doctor in almost all large towns. There are many Native physicians in the smaller towns—Burman doctors. I do not know whether they would be safe parties to handle a thing of that kind. They do not use it very largely in their medicines, so far as I know. They do not use medicine as we do. They make up their concoctions for all purposes They have teas, pills, powders, and broths. They take tiger's bones, hair, roots and herbs, and boil them and stew them. You can get a pice worth which, they say, will cure you of almost any disease. I have never known them to handle drugs, except roots and things they get from the jungle, and these charms.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Are the Shan States you have been speaking of districts bordering on the Kachin territory?

A.—Thibaw does. There are Kachins in the districts bordering on Thibaw. In north Theinni half the population are Kachins.

Q.—I rather gathered from you that you thought that the consumption in these Shan States, of which you have been speaking, is a thing of modern growth?

A.—Most Chinamen are opium consumers, and you will find them all through the district. The opium habit is known all over the Shan country. It is generally in the country districts and villages—what we call the jungle villages.

Q.—Dr. Cushing told us the other day at Rangoon that there was formerly a large consumption of opium in the Shan districts bordering on the Kachin territory. I suppose he was acquainted with the country before you were?

A.—Certainly: he has been here twenty or thirty years.

Q.—He said he could not speak of the condition of things recently: he spoke as to former times?

A.—Even in North Theinni the Kachins raise opium on the hills It is also raised in Tounghbang and Palaung. They raise opium up in the hills, but round Thibaw none is raised.

By the Chairman.—Q.—The Thibaw Sawbwa in giving his evidence before us expressed a readiness to stop the cultivation of opium?

A.—He would be very glad (at least he has always told me so) to prohibit it in his district as far as possible.

Q.—Do you say you have seen no cultivation of opium in his country?

A.—I have never seen it raised about Thibaw. On the hills where the Palaungs and the Kachins are, they raise opium. I do not know whether any is raised in his country; but I know there is not enough raised in Thibaw to make it an object in any way. I have been almost all over the Thibaw State, and I have never seen it growing; but among the Kachins in North Theinni I know that it is raised. I have known men go from Thibaw to buy it. Most of it comes from away up towards the Kunlon Railway. The people always go up there to get their opium and bring it down: they do not get it in the immediate vicinity of Thibaw.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—Have you ever heard why the Sawbwa of Thibaw did not stop opium in his dominions when he expressed himself anxious to stop it?

A.—He said, "There is a licensed shop at Maymyo just over the border; I cannot stop it." He always told me from the first time I talked to him about it, that he would be very glad to stop it if he could get co-operation, but it is impossible for one man to stop it alone; if they would unite with him he would be very glad.

Q.—You have told us that the use of the habit is very strong amongst those people; in fact, that even if they do give it up, they go back to it again.

A.—Yes; I have known them go back in nearly every case.

Q.—Do you really think that the stopping of the one shop in Maymyo would counterbalance the strong habit which these people have acquired of using opium?

A.—I do not suppose it would, so long as they can to come Mandalay to get as much as they want.

Q.—Do you think if the shop at Mandalay were closed as well as the shop at Maymyo, that they would break the strong habit which you have described?

A.—If that were done, Thibaw Sawbwa would, as far as possible, prohibit it in his district and they could not get it. I think it would be a great help. If a man has a craving for the drug, I do not suppose the closing of one or two shops, or any number of shops, would break his habit; but it would make it more difficult for him to get it, and it would prevent many others acquiring the habit.

Q.—Do not you think that opium grown in the other Shan States would be perfectly certain to go into the Thibaw State if it were forbidden, and if they could not get any opium out of British Burma?

A.—Not in large quantities; I do not think it would. Now it is sold in every bazar. You can buy it the same as rice or cutch or betelnut.

Q.—You say you have seen it coming up from Mandalay?

A.—You can see it almost every day. The traders come down from here with prepared opium to sell.

Q.—You see it in the Shan States; you do not mean to say you see it on the way up?

A.—I have seen it brought to the bazars in the Shan States, Chinamen come down and take it to the different villages a long way,—wherever there is a bazar. The custom in the Shan States is to have a bazar every fifth day in the large towns. The people come from all the surrounding country to the bazar. The next day it will be in another village and in another five days it will come round to the first village again. The traders come from down country here. They bring things they can sell, they go to the bazars, and follow the bazars round in that way. The people bring smoking opium to sell in the bazars.

Q.—This is what the traders themselves have told you?

A.—Yes. The Chinamen come down with their goods. I have asked them where they got it from, and they said they got it from Mandalay.

By the Chairman.—Q.—It is against the rules in Mandalay to sell quantities of opium?

A.—I do not know; I did not suppose it was against the rules, I supposed they could buy as much as they wanted.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—Would it be the smoking extract that they took back?

A.—Yes, not crude opium, but opium prepared in some way for smoking.

Q.—Is it suggested that they had not sufficient skill in the Shan States to prepare opium after the same manner: is this a superior article prepared by superior skill?

A.—I suppose that is the reason. I have known them take opium and boil it in water, and they make some kind of preparation that they smoke. I do not know how long it takes to cook it. I saw Chinamen doing this in Thibaw. That was the time when the Sawbwa made the trouble about it and forbade its being sold in the bazar, and tried to exclude it. In a little while, however, I saw opium coming up from down here. The Sawbwa said it was no use trying to forbid it.

By Mr. Mowbray.—Q.—If it be the case, as I believe it is, that the most which can be legally sold in Mandalay is limited in quantity, and if more than that quantity is taken into the Shan States, the failure is in enforcing the law which now exists?

A.—I cannot say about that, as I have never investigated the matter.

Q.—When we talk about the possibility of enforcing the general law of prohibition, is it not very material to consider whether it is possible to enforce the modified law of prohibition which is at present in force?

A.—My idea is that the modified prohibition which you have now simply leaves these people a chance of getting round it.

Q.—It leaves a chance to break the law?

A.—If it were absolutely prohibited, then it would be a contraband article and it could be dealt with. Now they claim to get it in a proper way, and I supposed they did.

By Sir William Roberts.—Q.—You said something about the action of opium in cases of dysentery. I think you said in the case of excessive opium-smoking you thought it could directly produce death?

A.—I would diagnose the case as one of dysentery. They have dysenteric stools and low fever. It is a chronic condition that goes on for months. As a rule, these Shans and others who come to the hospital in that way are frightened. They call it the opium dysentery. When they get that they think nothing can save them. Their feet begin to swell and in a short time they die. Sometimes they live one, two, or three months.

Q.—Has it been your own conclusion that dysentery was really produced by opium-smoking?

A.—I have not been able to find that it came from any indiscretion of diet, or anything of that sort. I think it is purely caused hy the drug, because so many opium smokers are peculiarly subject to it.

Q.—You have not called attention to the matter in any medical publication?

A.—I have never published it.

Q.—We have been enquiring along these lines and failed absolutely to get any evidence that opium-smoking or opium-eating in themselves produce any organic trouble. Since we have been in India, that is the evidence we have had uniformly. The Surgeons in connection with the hospitals absolutely deny any knowledge of the opium habit causing organic disease, but they say it produces failure of appetite and loss of flesh?

A.—I have had numerous cases within the last two years—no less than twenty-five cases of what I call opium dysentery. I cannot trace the disease to anything else.

Q.—You said that dysentery is very common in those regions among all sorts of people : had you any marks by which you could distinguish those cases from ordinary dysentry?

A.—The opium dysentery is acute.

Q.—I mean dysentery among the people who took opium?

A.—I have had many cases where a person had diarrhœa or dysentery and had taken opium ostensibly for the disease. They said they had heard that opium was good for it, and they had taken it in that way. Afterwards they had become addicted to the habit. The disease would only be of temporary duration. Those cases, however, which I spoke of as opium dysentery, are organic cases that last for months.

Q.—Ordinary dysentery in a thing which lasts for many months?

A.—That is true, but in the Shan States my experience with the people is that it is an acute disease. I have very seldom known it amongst those people run into a chronic stage.

Q.—You could not point out any special diagnostic mark by which you could distinguish a case of opium dysentery from dysentery in an opium-smoker?

A.—No : the disease is almost identical, except that the disease in the opium-smoker sometimes would be acute ; there is more pain with it and more fever, and very likely there would be nausea : whereas with ordinary cases there is no nausea ; it is simply slight bloody stools occurring frequently night and day, and the patients finally lose control of the bowels, and when they get into that condition they consider themselves hopeless.

Q.—Have you made any *post mortem* examination in such cases?

A.—Several.

Q.—Could you distinguish the local lesions from those in ordinary chronic dysentery?

A.—No, I cannot say there would be anything different from what you would get in chronic cases of ordinary dysentery.

Q.—Our difficulty, as doctors, is to distinguish between *post hoc* and *propter hoc*: are you satisfied in your own mind that opium was a coincident or an etiological factor?

A.—I am inclined to believe that it is not a coincident. I am inclined to think that it was the cause of the disease. It causes more or less constipation, which, I think, is the prime cause of the disease.

Q.—We have had this sort of evidence given us repeatedly, that the opium habit carried far tends to make those who carry it to excess more liable to dysentery?

A.—Yes, and opium-diarrhœa is very common among these cases.

Q.—You do not think that would account for the cases which you have seen—that people being reduced to poverty and opium-smoking to a low state of health would take dysentery more frequently than other people?

A.—That might be, but as a rule those cases yield to treatment in the hospital; but so far as I have seen in cases of opium-dysentery, it is almost useless to try any treatment.

Q.—I suppose those are far-advanced cases?

A.—Yes, as a rule.

Q.—Did I understand you to say that you do not admit opium smokers to Church fellowship?

A.—We do not admit them. One man was dismissed from our Church. The only case of discipline we had last year was that of a man who became an opium smoker since I baptised him in Thibaw.

Q.—Do you adopt the same rule with regard to drinkers of alcohol?

A.—In our Church covenant those are two points made.

Q.—Your duty would be the same with regard to alcohol as with a opium?

A.—It would, with reference to these Natives in connection with Church fellowship.

Q.—Of course you do not regard tobacco in the same light?

A.—No.

Q.—Is *bhang* looked upon in the same light?

A.—It is not used in the Shan States generally. I have never come across it in my practice. I have never known a Shan to use it at all.

Printed by
Joseph Culshaw, Manager, Methodist Publishing House, Calcutta.

Pam-
Drugs
Opium

SUPPLEMENT TO "THE FRIEND OF CHINA"] [MAY, 1895.

LIBRARY

ROYAL COMMISSION ON OPIUM.

MINUTE OF DISSENT

PRESENTED BY

MR. HENRY J. WILSON, M.P.

With his Notes,

MEMORANDUM ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE AUTHORITIES IN INDIA,

AND

PROTEST AGAINST TREATMENT OF NATIVE COMMISSIONERS, &c.

With Portrait and Table of Contents.

PUBLISHED FOR
THE SOCIETY FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE OPIUM TRADE,
FINSBURY HOUSE, BLOMFIELD STREET, LONDON, E.C.,
BY
P. S. KING & SON, PARLIAMENTARY BOOKSELLERS,
KING STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W

PRICE ONE PENNY.

CONTENTS OF SUPPLEMENT.

I.—Minute of Dissent by H. J. Wilson, M.P.

		PAGE
Paras. 1, 2.	Introductory	1
„ 3, 4.	Classification of Witnesses...	1
Para. 5.	Change in Official Statements as to Opium	1
Paras. 6 to 10.	Production of Opium	2
„ 11, 12.	Compensation on Termination of Poppy Cultivation	5
Para. 13.	Conflicting Policies	6
Paras. 14 to 19.	Export to China, &c., the principal purpose for which Opium is produced in British India	7
„ 20, 21.	Modes of Use and Prevalence of Habit in British India ...	9
Para. 22.	Use by the Troops	10
„ 23.	No Analogy between Alcohol in England and Opium in India ...	10
Paras. 24 to 30.	Purposes for which Opium is consumed	11
Para. 31.	Smoking Opium	12
„ 32.	Physical Effects of the Habitual Use of Opium	13
„ 33.	Moral „ „ „	14
„ 34.	Social „ „	14
„ 35.	Counteracting Effect of Rich Food—Excessive Use admittedly injurious—Tendency to increase the dose	14
„ 36.	Comparative Effects on Europeans and Indians	15
„ 37.	Indian Missionary Opinion	15
„ 38.	Recommendation as to Restriction of General Use in India... ...	16
Paras. 39, 40.	Recommendation as to Prohibition of Opium-smoking	17
Para. 41.	Burma; Reforms reluctantly yielded by Indian Government; Recommendation as to Extension	18
„ 42.	Malwa Opium: where Produced and how Taxed	19
Paras. 43 to 47.	The Native States; Nature and Object of Existing Arrangements; Practicability of Stopping Export; Absurd Character of Claims for Compensation	19
Para. 48.	Conclusions; Answers to Questions referred to Commission ...	21
„ 49.	Reflection on Nature of Majority Report	23
„ 50.	Reply to Observation by Majority	23

II.—Appendix—Notes to Mr. Wilson's Dissent.

Note A.	Resolution of House of Commons giving rise to Commission ...	24
„ B.	Official Opinion of Opium	24
„ C.	Short Description of Poppy Growth as Affecting Individual Ryot ...	25
„ D.	Extract from Correspondence on Administration of Opium Department, showing Diminished Popularity of Poppy Growth	26
„ E.	On Difficulty of Maintaining Poppy Cultivation...	26
„ F.	Official Inquiries on Complaints of Compulsion to Cultivate Poppy	26
„ G.	Case of Potatoes Uprooted at Barni, near Patna...	28
„ H.	Condemnation of Opium by English Officials resident in China and Java	29
„ J.	Chinese Official Condemnation of Opium...	29
„ K.	Condemnation of Opium by Missionaries in China	30
„ L.	Quotations and References as to alleged Extensive Use of Opium and Political Danger from Interference...	30
„ M.	Average of Opium taken by Adult Male Consumers	31
„ N.	Table showing Consumption of Opium by Provinces	32
„ O.	Table showing extremes of Large and Small Consumption in selected localities	33
„ P.	Licentious Purpose for which Opium is consumed	34
„ Q.	Quotations and References as to Physical Effects of Opium	34
„ R.	„ „ Moral „	35
„ S.	„ „ Social „	36
„ T.	Pro-Opiumists' Evidence as to Effects of Excessive Use	36
„ U.	Difficulty of Discontinuance of Habit	37
„ V.	Comparative Effects on Natives of Europe and India	37
„ V.V.	Quotations and References as to Prohibition, except for medical use	38
„ W.	Further Evidence as to Opium-Smoking	39
„ X.	Opium Revenue	40
„ Y.	Medical Evidence against new Theory that Opium is Prophylactic against Fever	40
„ Z.	Letter showing that Majority did not desire Mr. Wilson's suggestions on Draft Report	40

III.—Memorandum by Mr. Wilson on the Attitude of the Authorities in India 41

IV.—Further Protest by Mr. Wilson 46



MR. HENRY J. WILSON, M.P.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON OPIUM.

Minute of Dissent, by Mr. Henry J. Wilson, M.P.

1. As I am unable to concur in the report prepared by my colleagues, it is necessary that I should submit a statement of my own views upon the principal subjects of the inquiry. I desire to do so as briefly as possible.

2. The resolution of the House of Commons in pursuance of which the Commission was appointed was proposed by Mr. Gladstone, and carried by 184 to 105. The minority, consisting mainly of those who may be described, for brevity's sake, as the Anti-opium Party, desired the appointment of a Commission for a very different and more useful purpose than that which was finally recommended by the resolution of the House. NOTE A.

3. The 722 witnesses who appeared before us may be roughly divided into three classes, 191 who disapprove of the general use of opium, or are opposed for various reasons to the present opium system, or anti-opiumists; 487 more or less approving that system, or pro-opiumists; and 44 neutral or unclassified, including those who appeared purely for statistical or other evidence of a restricted character.

4. The anti-opiumist witnesses who were Natives of India were, generally speaking, not equal to the pro-opiumists in wealth and social position, but were not on that account less able to represent the habits and opinions of the great mass of their fellow-countrymen. This class includes a majority of the native journalists, lawyers, teachers, and professors. Of qualified non-official native medical practitioners, a considerable majority were either anti-opiumists or somewhat undecided in their views. An enormous majority of the medical and other Christian missionaries who appeared before the Commission also gave anti-opium evidence.

The pro-opiumists, on the other hand, represented the great majority of the official classes, both European and Native, including military medical officers, together with many titled personages, landowners, and persons who considered that their financial interests were at stake.

5. A change appears to have come over official statements in reference to opium within the last few years. These were, until very recently, almost invariably condemnatory of the drug.

Note B.

Illustrations of this are given in the Notes, and it will suffice to make here one quotation only. On the 24th October, 1817, the Directors of the East India Company, writing to the Governor-General, referred to their desire "to restrain the use of this pernicious drug," and went on to say, "were it possible to "prevent the use of the drug altogether, except strictly for the "purpose of medicine, we would gladly do it in compassion to mankind."

It will be seen from the evidence, some of which is hereafter referred to, that a very considerable body of officials now adopt a decidedly altered tone. No definite cause has been assigned for this change, but it is impossible to dissociate it from the financial difficulties of India, and from the pressure of the anti-opium movement in England having been increasingly associated with the discussion on the reduction of Indian expenditure.

Production of Opium.

6. The production of opium in British India is not specially mentioned in the reference to the Commission, but it seems desirable to make some allusion to it.

So far as British India is concerned, the interest may be said to be almost confined to what is commonly known as the "Bengal Monopoly System,"* under which the cultivation of poppy is (for the convenience of surveillance) concentrated in two areas, known as the Behar Agency, with its head-quarters and factory at Patna, and the Benares Agency, with its head-quarters and factory at Ghazipur. The cultivation is by Act XIII. of 1857 restricted to cultivators who have received license to grow poppy.

Vol. II., p. 335.

On the average of the last three years (1890-1 to 1892-3), as to which returns were supplied, 243,605 acres of poppy were grown in the Behar Agency, and 229,574 acres in the Benares Agency, making together 473,179 acres.

Taking the average of the same three years, the licensed cultivators, numbering 1,247,941, delivered to the officials 78,944 maunds of opium, or about 57,995 cwts., for which they received Rs. 15,774,607, say, £854,457,† including certain advances made before sowing or delivery.

From these figures it will be found that the average cultivator delivered about 5·20 lbs. and received Rs. 12·64, say 13s. 8¼d.†

5254-8, 10,807-8, 12,226, 12,963, 13,679, 19,535.

It is claimed that the cultivator is greatly benefited by getting an advance "without interest," but this advance is under 6s. and

* The "Bengal Monopoly System" provides 98 per cent. of the opium produced in British India. The remaining 2 per cent. is produced in the Punjab and Ajmere-Merwara. As to opium produced in the Native States, see pars. 42-47.

† Here and elsewhere the value of the rupee has been taken at 1s. 1d. English.

for only part of the year, so that at 5 per cent. per annum the interest would amount to less than $2\frac{1}{4}$d. per cultivator.

See Note C. — Note C.

7. It is said that there was a time when the poppy was a generally remunerative, and, therefore, popular crop. But it is certain from the correspondence which took place in 1881 between the Secretary of State and the Government of India, that it was not then by any means universally popular. — Return, C. 3378, "Opium negotiations with China," 1882. Vol. II., 5300 to 5304.

In 1883 a Commission was appointed to inquire into the administration of the Opium Department, and from official correspondence which arose out of the report of that Commission it is perfectly clear that in some districts many of the ryots were reluctant to undertake the cultivation of the poppy. — Vol. V., App. I. Note D.

The Commission of 1883 made numerous recommendations for improving the position of the poppy cultivator, but most of their recommendations have been neglected by the authorities. — 13,521 to 13,534.

There is still difficulty in obtaining the quantity of ground desired by the Government, and methods, which in India are called "persuasion" and in England compulsion, have to be resorted to. — 2767, 6282, 10 909, 13 397, 11,362-3, 19,093. Note E.

The evidence showed that this compulsion is greater in the Behar than in the Benares Agency; it is natural, also, that it should be greater in the places where the poppy is least productive.

It is the duty of the zilladars, the lower officials of the Opium Department, who are distributed all over the opium districts, to induce the people to apply for licenses and advances and to bring them to the weighment places. Mr. Gregory called this "coolie driving" (*a*), and although he afterwards said it meant only to collect them (*b*), I fail to reconcile this kind of driving or collecting with anxiety on the part of the people to obtain the alleged privilege of cultivating (*c*). — (*a*) 13,457. (*b*) 13,579. (*c*) 2927, 3249, 19,343 4, 19,535-7, 10,795-6, 14,942, 19,126.

The most conclusive evidence on this subject is furnished by what has happened since the Commission left India. The Indian Revenue Department's Resolution No. 2208, 20th April, 1894, comments on the decrease in the area of cultivation, giving among other reasons the competition of other crops, and states "that the "price of opium paid to cultivators will have to be increased in "order to keep pace with the rise of prices of other produce." In accordance with this, the price paid to the cultivators has been raised 20 per cent., viz., from Rs. 5 to Rs. 6 per seer. This proceeding in the present condition of Indian finance is in curious and suggestive contrast with the official evidence presented to the Commission as to the profitable, and therefore popular, character of poppy cultivation.

8. The official witnesses denied that compulsion was practised (*h*). Mr. Forbes, who holds the important position of Commissioner of Patna, stated (*d*) "as far as I know the cultivators grow it entirely — (*h*) 2920, 19,131, 19,537. (*d*) 10,829.

of their own free will." He also said that the charge of compulsion had taken the officials by surprise (*e*). "The charge, in my "opinion, arises entirely from the ignorance of the gentlemen, who, "no doubt in good faith have conceived an entirely mistaken "idea of the relations between ourselves and the inhabitants "generally of the country" (*f*).

(*e*) 12,079, 5399.

(*f*) 12,156.

Yet at the same time he informed the Commission that, in consequence of a rumour from Calcutta only a week before, he had been making special inquiries into the allegations, and that in that short time he had heard of three cases, as to which he undertook to make further and strict inquiry (*g*).

(*g*) 12,079.

It appears from Lord Brassey's remark (Q. 12,081) that Mr. Forbes had already spoken to him on the subject, and it was dismissed at the time by Lord Brassey's statement to Mr. Forbes :—

"You have assured me that you will not allow the matter to be neglected, and that if there is anything wrong the man shall be punished."

The result of these inquiries has been communicated by Mr. Forbes since our return to England, and will be found in Appendix XXXII., Vol. V., a perusal of which, and of Note F., will show that a zilladar, or inferior officer of the Opium Department, was seriously implicated in one case, that Mr. Christian, sub-deputy opium agent of Shahabad, was compromised in two cases, and Mr. Skrine, who holds the important office of Collector of Bhagalpur, was guilty of direct interference and pressure for the purpose of promoting opium cultivation.

Note F.

There is no evidence that any official has been subjected to any censure or discipline.

9. Exactions of every kind are practised by the zilladars and other subordinate officials on the ryots. The Commission of 1883 reported, "Every seer of opium which a cultivator delivers "pays toll to the amlah (subordinate official), and from every "rupee which a cultivator receives a per-centage is deducted for "their benefit." It was admitted by official witnesses that illegal exactions have continued (*c*), that little attempt is made to detect them (*d*), and it is too plain from Mr. Wace's cautious answers, that even some European officials (*e*) are not altogether free from suspicion.

Report, 1883, par. 638.

(*c*) 10 851, 12,336, 12,149.

(*d*) 12,325.

(*e*) 10,899, 10,901.

10. Cases were reported to us (*f*) showing that the officials of the Opium Department, not content with the severe law providing ample punishment for offences, take upon themselves to summarily destroy the crops of cultivators who have, or who are supposed to have, neglected to grow the full quantity of poppy for which they have taken advances. One very interesting and suggestive case

(*f*) 11,355-89, 12,396-454, 20,444.*

* The petition, which is not printed, alleges that part of a wheat-field was "unsowed" by officials of the Opium Department.

of this kind, of which full particulars are given in the Notes, was proved beyond all doubt, and no attempt was made to disprove the others. NOTE G.

Resolution of Revenue Department, No. 2208, of 20th April, 1894, states that in nearly 70 per cent. of the cases of alleged infraction of the opium laws in the Aliganj Sub-Division in the year 1892-3, "departmental punishment was inflicted on the "offenders, who were all opium cultivators, instead of sending "them up to the criminal court." If this means that cultivators have been summarily punished as in one of the cases above referred to, it is much to be regretted that the Government of Bengal should, since the Commission left India, have expressed its approval of "the course adopted in the Aliganj Sub-Agency of "punishing opium cultivators departmentally."

COMPENSATION ON TERMINATION OF POPPY CULTIVATION.

11. Some of the Government witnesses (*a*) as well as persons financially interested (*b*) suggested that if the Bengal monopoly system should be terminated, compensation ought to be paid to the zemindars and ryots. It has become common to speak of "prohibition" in connexion with this matter, but it must be remembered that prohibition has already been enacted by the Opium Acts of 1857 and 1878 (*c*), and cultivation is punishable except in the case of persons duly provided with annual licenses under stringent conditions.

(*a*) 2080, 5254, 14,398, 26,832.
(*b*) 14,441, 13,943-60.
(*c*) Vol. II., pp. 527 and 531. 2943.

Cultivation has been terminated through the greater part of British India by general prohibitory enactment. It has also been terminated frequently and extensively simply by the non-issue of licenses. This course has sometimes been adopted, wholesale, in a given locality for the purpose of "facilitating excise" (*c*), or, because it is "unremunerative to the Department" (*d*). This termination by the non-issue of licenses has also been continually practised when the accumulation of reserve stock, the falling off of the export trade, or other reasons, rendered such a course desirable in the interests of Government (*e*).

(*c*) 19,117, 14,932.
(*d*) 19,109.
(*e*) 2943 and 3019.

In none of these different cases has any compensation whatever been made by Government either to the zemindars or to the ryots (*f*).

(*f*) 3020, 2122, 13,754. 19,153, 14,938, 5775.

12. It was also contended by some witnesses that termination of poppy cultivation must needs be accompanied by reduction both of land revenue (*g*) and of rents payable by the ryots (*h*). But repeated questions failed to elicit evidence of a single case of reduction of rent, (*j*) and only one instance was laid before us (so far as I know) in which a reduction of land revenue (*k*) was said to be consequent on termination of poppy cultivation. In this solitary case the reduction was not made till after the lapse of

(*g*) 13,694, 17,369.
(*h*) 5333, 10,821, 6095.
(*j*) 5306-9, 6130, 5569, 6172, 8514-5, 14,371.
(*k*) Vol. IV., p. 512, par. 12.

some 14 years, during which period many other causes may have affected the assessment.

Conflicting Policies.

2086. Hansard, Vol. 352, p. 343.

13. In the opium debate in the House of Commons, on the 10th April, 1891, the late Mr. W. H. Smith, the then Leader of the House, stated, "The course which this Government has "taken, and which all Governments have taken during the last "few years . . . has been to diminish the area of cultivation "in India"; and Sir James Fergusson, speaking on behalf of the

2088. Hansard, Vol. 352, p. 323.

India Office, said: "I freely admit that the Government of India "have never denied that it would be very desirable that this "source of revenue should be altered. They have taken means "to reduce it. They have diminished the number of licenses, "and they diminished the area on which the poppy was grown. "One million acres * less are now under poppy in Bengal than 10 "years ago."

Sir David Barbour, Finance Member of the Governor-General's Council, having had his attention called to these utterances, said

2086.

in reference to Mr. Smith's statements: "I should hardly say that "he is speaking there of the policy of the Government of India. "I should say he was speaking of the policy of the Home "Government, and, I must say, I was not aware until that state- "ment was made that it was the policy of the Home Government."

2077.

He also said: "As regards the export of opium from Bengal, the "policy has been for some time to sell about the same amount "every year, neither diminishing that amount nor increasing it. "This means, of course, that the average area under cultivation "would remain about the same, rising or falling a little according

2087.

"to circumstances." In reply to other questions, he said: "It is

2089.

"not to be wondered at that members of the Government at "home should not be perfectly informed of the facts. . . . I "believe that on various occasions inaccurate impressions have "been conveyed to" the House of Commons.

From this it will be seen that the important statements made by Ministers in the debate in question were entirely erroneous as to the policy really being pursued. They were also erroneous as to the actual facts. The average area under cultivation for the decade ending 1862-3 was 338,153 acres; 1872-3, 475,048 acres; 1882-3, 518,625 acres; and for 1892-3, 512,663 acres.

The resolution proposed by Mr. Gladstone and adopted by the House of Commons on the 30th June, 1893, was based upon the same kind of erroneous information, because it pressed "on the "Government of India to continue their policy of greatly diminish-

* Hansard gives "one million acres," which is evidently a mistake. Other reports give 100,000.

"ing the cultivation of the poppy, and the production and sale of "opium." Two different Ministries, and two different Parliaments, were entirely misled as to the action of the Government of India.

The principal Purpose for which Opium is produced in British India.

14. The main purpose of the production and sale of opium in British India unquestionably is to supply the Chinese and other Eastern markets.

The average production of opium in British India during the last three years as to which returns were supplied was 54,707 cwts., of which 49,512 cwts., or 90·5 per cent., was "intended for export "to China and the Straits Settlements, technically known as "*provision* opium"; the remainder "intended for consumption in "India, technically known as *excise* opium," was 5,195 cwts., or 9·5 per cent. Of that which is exported to the Straits Settlements, a large proportion is re-shipped to China. Practically the whole of the Government opium thus sent to China and other Eastern countries is used for the purpose of smoking. That this practice of smoking is in the highest degree prejudicial, morally and physically, to those who indulge in it is established beyond all reasonable doubt.

Vol. II., p. 345, pars. 6-7.

15. English officials resident in China and the far East have for the last 100 years continuously referred to opium smoking as a cause of moral and physical destruction. (*See* Note H.)

Note H.

The Chinese Government and Chinese officials have used similar, or even stronger language. (*See* Note J.)

Note J.

From the time when the earliest Christian missionaries became acquainted with the habits of the Chinese, down to the present year, they have persistently borne testimony to the same deplorable facts. (*See* Note K.)

Note K.

The oral (*a*) and written (*b*) evidence presented to the Commission is overwhelming in its force against the opium habit in China. Sir Thomas Wade (*c*) who said that "the treatment of "the question by the Anti-opium Association engages me on the "other side" said also at the same time "no man who has lived "the time that I have in China, and who has been in contact with "Chinese of all kinds, can deny that the excessive use of opium "in that country is an exceeding misfortune to that country." Such extenuating evidence as reached us is mainly negative in its character, and vague in its terms. The evidence of medical missionaries (Dr. Maxwell, Rev. Hudson Taylor, M.R.C.S., and others), after years of daily contact with the people, was not only definite and specific, but is in the main confirmed by the written opinions of other medical men received by the Commission. The majority of the English officials in China who sent answers to the questions agree in this condemnation. One of the questions sent

(*a*) 165, 214, 287, 380, 430, 450, 493, 549, 609, 639, 673, 751, 790, 825, 1509, 1638, 1863, 1961.
(*b*) Vol. V., pp. 212-343.
(*c*) 1285.

214, 380.

was whether, if the Indian opium supply was stopped, the people would take to alcohol. The replies, in the proportion of about 40 to 6, are that it would not have this effect.

It would occupy too much space to refer at length to the consular, missionary, and other evidence from China, which will be found in Vol. V., App. XXVI., but it is abundantly manifest that opium in China is a gigantic national evil.

16. It is, therefore, impossible to avoid the conclusion that it is altogether unworthy for a great dependency of the British Empire to be thus engaged in a traffic which produces such widespread misery and disaster. It is known that the cultivation of opium is now largely carried on in China, with the connivance, if not the express permission of the authorities, and without throwing any doubt on the sincerity of the desire of Chinese statesmen to rid their country of the blight of opium, it is impossible to say, especially in the present condition of the Chinese Empire, whether the cessation of importation of Indian opium would be accompanied or followed by any serious attempt on the part of the Chinese Government to exclude opium from other sources, and to prohibit its cultivation within the limits of their own empire. But however that may be, a traffic which is contrary to the principles of humanity cannot be justified on the ground that, if we do not engage in it, it will fall into the hands of others who have no such scruples.

Q. 11.

17. The effects of the consumption of opium in the Straits Settlements and other places in the east are substantially the same as already described in the case of China. A similar objection, therefore, exists to its production and sale for these other localities and nationalities.

18. The result of careful consideration of this part of the subject is that in my opinion the opium trade with China and the far East should be prohibited.

19. Sir James Fergusson, speaking as Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs on behalf of the Government, declared on the 10th April, 1891, in the House of Commons, that—

Hansard, Vol. 352, p. 316.

"The Chinese at any time may terminate the treaty on giving "12 months' notice, and to protect themselves they may increase "the duty to any extent they please, or they may exclude it "altogether. This, I think I may say, that if the Chinese "Government thought proper to raise the duty to a prohibitive "extent, or shut out the article altogether, this country would not "expend one pound in powder and shot or lose the life of a "soldier in an attempt to force opium upon the Chinese."

Vol. I., App. IV.

Exception was taken to the accuracy of the first part of this statement by some of the witnesses opposed to the trade. A memorandum from the Foreign Office shows that Sir James Fergusson was mistaken in saying that China could free herself

from all treaty obligations in the matter by giving 12 months' notice. The remainder of Sir James Fergusson's statement is sufficiently explicit as regards the policy of Her Majesty's Ministers at the time, but it is very important that the British Government should make a definite declaration in that sense to the Chinese Government.

The Consumption of Opium in British India.

20. Opium is consumed in three ways (*a*):—I. By eating (*b*) in the form of small portions, or pills; II. By drinking decoctions of the crude drug, known as *kasumba* (*c*) and *amal pani*; or an infusion of poppy heads, or capsules, called *post* (*d*); III. By smoking preparations of opium, known as *chandu* (*e*) (the Chinese form) and *madat*, or *madak* (*f*), or *gooli* (*g*). The first method (eating, or more correctly, swallowing) is that by which far the greatest quantity of opium is consumed.

(*a*) 26 040, 21,116, 25,903.
(*b*) 26,060, 20,323.
(*c*) 26,040, 26,802.
(*d*) 20,212, 20,323.
(*e*) 13,480-4, 26,040, 27,389.
(*f*) 26,060.
(*g*) 4512.

The evidence laid before us as to the prevalence of the opium habit was very contradictory. Many witnesses, including some of the most important officials, gave evidence which tended to show that the habitual use of opium is widely prevalent amongst the various populations. This view was urged upon us by repeated statements that the consumption is so necessary to the happiness, well being, and even life of the people that it would be impossible to contemplate prohibition, or even any serious increase of restriction of the supply, because the result would not improbably be such general discontent as would amount to serious political danger. (*See* Note L.)

Note L.

Evidence of a directly contradictory character was given by many other witnesses, including a considerable proportion of natives of India, who may reasonably be supposed to be better acquainted with the habits of their relations, friends, and neighbours than officials, and especially highly placed officials, can possibly be. In order to arrive at some conclusion upon this conflicting testimony, it will be convenient to form some opinion as to what may be considered an average consumer's daily dose, and then to examine the actual statistics of consumption.

21. The particulars given in the Notes show that the average quantity taken daily by each adult male consumer is about 20 grains. Taking this in conjunction with the evidence of many Government witnesses as to the very wide prevalence of the habit, the impression conveyed to the mind must be that there is a consumption far in excess of anything that is shown by the actual statistics.

Note M.

An examination of the statistics for each province shows that in Assam, where the consumption is largest, the quantity of opium issued is only sufficient to supply 20 grains daily to one person out of 52 of the entire population, while in the province of Madras, at

Note N.

the other end of the scale, the supply is only sufficient for one person out of 521 of the population.

Note O.

But greatly as the provinces differ from each other, various localities in these provinces differ still more widely, for while in Calcutta the consumption is equal to 20 grains daily for one person out of 26, in Tippera it will only provide the same quantity for one person out of 8,588.

It is clear from the Notes above referred to, and from the evidence on which they are founded, that the popular ideas which seem to prevail among Europeans in India are entirely irreconcilable with the actual facts.

Even if it could be shown that the average consumption of individuals is less than 20 grains, the argument is not materially affected. Moreover in these calculations no allowance is made for legitimate medical use, nor for the practice which is said to prevail of giving opium to animals.

Vol. V., p. 127. 20,323.

Use of Opium by the Troops.

22. A general impression has prevailed, and important witnesses (*a*) gave evidence as to the general use of opium by the native troops, and especially by the Sikhs. The evidence taken in India shows this to be a delusion. Major-General Sir Robert Low, K.C.B., in command of the Oudh District, stated (*b*) that the highest number of opium-eaters reported in any one regiment under his command was 20; in the Ghoorka regiment only two consumers; and in another, none. Evidence was given by other military witnesses as to the consumption of Opium by Sikhs in 12 corps. As to two of these (*c*) it was stated that opium was consumed by all. In two cases (*d*) the proportion appears to average about 33 per cent. In eight cases (*e*) the proportion varied from 1·3 per cent. to 6·5 per cent., or an average of 3·1 per cent. Colonel Jamieson, although a decided pro-opiumist, admitted (*f*) that the Rajputs in his regiment, as a rule, do not take opium. Official information (*g*) shows that while 23 regiments, including two Sikh regiments, made no arrangements for the supply of opium while on service, 3 lbs. were taken by the 23rd Bengal Infantry as sufficient for two years, and small quantities taken by the 32nd Bengal Infantry and the 3rd Sikh Infantry were brought back untouched.

(*a*) 872, 1559.

(*b*) 14,110-2.

(*c*) 14,117, 18,641.

(*d*) 18,688, 17,017.

(*e*) 18,704, 14,147, 15,751, 19,893, 17,059, 16,943, 7,108, 17,017.

(*f*) 14,163.

(*g*) Vol. II., p. 453.

No Analogy between Alcohol in England and Opium in India.

23. In whatever way the statistics are looked at, they show that there are in India vast tracts where a mere fraction of the population are consumers of opium. In England, on the other hand, the great majority of the people are more or less consumers of alcohol. Any attempt therefore to treat the case as analogous

is entirely fallacious; in the one case we have a nation of consumers, in the other a nation of abstainers.

Purposes for which Opium is consumed.

24. It may be plainly stated at the outset that there is a general consensus of native opinion (*a*) in almost all parts of India against the habitual use of opium by the healthy and able-bodied.

(*a*) 13,336, 17,513-4, 18,836, 20,133, 24,937, 28,061, and many others.

25. The importance of opium, as a remedy in certain diseases, has never been disputed. It is daily used in many parts of India, not only for specific ailments, for which it would be prescribed by European practitioners, but in many other cases, with the object of relieving pain, although it may have no permanent effect on the cause of the pain. The theory was advanced by some witnesses (*b*) that the habitual use of opium for non-medical purposes must have originated in the case of each consumer for the purpose of repressing some positive ailment, or to avoid disease which climatic or other conditions render probable. In accordance with this theory evidence was given before us (*c*) as to the belief of the natives, in many malarious districts, that opium is a prophylactic against fever, and that such belief was shared by many Europeans, (*d*) principally military medical officers. On the other hand, this view was strongly controverted by other witnesses, (*e*) including medical practitioners, both European and Native, who disputed the value of opium as a prophylactic against malarial fever, or as a remedy in the disease, and as regards many parts of India there was no such belief amongst the natives (*f*). It was clearly established by the evidence that the habit of consuming opium is practised by a certain portion of the inhabitants in many parts of India for purposes which have no relation to the actual presence or even fear of disease. Many men begin the consumption of opium at about the age of 40, (*g*) under the impression that the system is stimulated and the declining bodily powers preserved by its use. Under these circumstances, it does not appear to incur popular disapproval.

(*b*) 13,089, 17,283, 28,107, 21,878, 2147, 4992, and many others.

(*c*) 3657, 19,528, 25,583, 27,574.

(*d*) 2188, 3404, 3606, 21,901-2, 28,141, 9516-7.

(*e*) 4710-5, 13,116, 5837, 16,558, 16,902, 19,203, and many others.

(*f*) 8642, 4280, 9132, 9852, 13,382-3, 18,195, and many others.

(*g*) 3943, 12,576, 4060, 26,061, and many others.

26. There is a special and licentious purpose for which opium is taken, and when it is habitually used by young and healthy men it is usually for this purpose, which is universally reprobated as vicious and degrading. (*See* Note P.)

Note P.

27. Opium is in some districts frequently taken by persons requiring to make special or unusual exertion (*h*) in enterprises involving fatigue and exposure, while others entirely deny that any advantage is derived from such use, (*j*) and on the contrary maintain that the stimulation which it affords is merely temporary and delusive. This idea as to the benefit of opium under such conditions is similar to the belief which formerly prevailed in England as to the use of alcohol in the like circumstances, but

(*h*) 10,038, 15,762, 19,192, 20,990.

(*j*) 8596-9, 8612, 9848, 18,253, 19,029, 23,457, and many others.

which the experience obtained in Arctic and other arduous enterprises has now proved to be delusive.

20,982, 21,577, 23,656, 24,659.

28. The drug is also used in some provinces and castes as a mark of friendship and hospitality in connexion with family and social ceremonies.

29. To infants from the time of birth until they are three or four years of age opium in minute doses is habitually given in many parts of India, (*k*) partly with the impression that it protects them against disease, but chiefly in order to keep them quiet, and prevent them from crying in the absence of the mothers when engaged in household or field work.

(*k*) 23,104, 25,867, 13 994, 15,672, 11,808, 3502, and many others.

(*a*) 16,266, 21,577. 23,261, 25,876.
(*b*) 16,902, 21,298, 23,491*a*, 26,619, 25,894.

This practice is defended (*a*) in general terms by several witnesses, and strongly condemned (*b*) by many who are specific in their enumeration of the evils which follow. The best excuses offered are the poverty and the ignorance of the parents.

(*l*) 24,671, 25,865, 26,674.

Vol. IV., p. 498.

In Bombay there is an extensive use of Bala Gooli, (*l*) that is, pills made of opium mixed with other drugs and spices for the use of children. This is at present carried on under the sanction of the authorities, which in my opinion should be withheld.

30. The practice of drinking the decoctions or infusions of opium, already alluded to, is somewhat restricted. It appears to be mainly confined to Rajputana and the Punjaub, and to be chiefly associated with social and ceremonial observances (*m*). There is some evidence that this use is declining (*n*).

(*m*) 16,231, 20,990, 21,987.
(*n*) 22,776, 23,750, 26,429.

Smoking Opium.

(*a*) 3510, 16,546.

31. The smoking of chandu and madak is usually a social (*a*), as distinguished from a personal, habit, and appears to be principally confined to the cities and large towns (*b*). It is almost universally admitted to be injurious and demoralising, is practised by the vicious and degraded (*c*), and is generally reprobated (*d*).

(*b*) 16,766-7, 28,082, 18,564, 27,065.
(*c*) 27,388, 3843, 15,698, 19,527, 16,012, 17,705.
(*d*) 27,467, 20,698, 11,858, 21,870. 21,812.

In view of the evils attending the habit, smoking on licensed premises was forbidden throughout British India (*e*) on the 25th September, 1891.

(*e*) Vol. II., p. 396.

Evidence was given that smoking clubs, so-called (though without any pretence of paid membership), existed before the issue of this prohibition, and have multiplied since. Very little effort had apparently been made to suppress them. There appears to be no reason why the authorities should not have taken steps to acquire any further powers which were needed for this purpose as they were invited to do by the Home Government.

5008, 15,170-72, 16,684-709, 26,948.

Secretary of State's letter, Vol. II., p. 396.

Three missionaries and a newspaper editor at Bombay having exposed certain incidents connected with the sale of opium were proceeded against for defamation by the manager of the opium farmer in that city. At one of the trials which took place after we left India, Mr. Cooper, the presiding magistrate, stated in his

judgment, "it is admitted that during the last Mahim fair, "there were five or six of these clubs opened at Mahim, "and the statement in the article regarding the mismanage- "ment of these clubs appears to be true." In the course of these proceedings, the following remarkable evidence was given by the chief opium inspector at Bombay :—"There are about 150 "clubs at Bombay. . . . I do not think the opium-smoking "clubs at Bombay and at Mahim are undesirable. . . . I "do not think the opium-smoking establishments should be shut "up, therefore we have not tried to shut them up." It is noticeable that since the imprisonment of the missionaries the opium officials at Bombay have instituted proceedings against several of these so-called clubs, and have obtained convictions against them.

The question of dealing with unlicensed opium-smoking clubs in India has been compared to that of preventing illegal sales of alcohol in clubs in England. There is this important difference, that the question in England is how to prevent the consumption in unlicensed places of beverages which are not disapproved by public opinion generally. In India it is a question of stopping a practice under all circumstances which incurs almost universal reprobation. 26,218, 26,948.

Physical Effects of the Habitual Use of Opium.

32. A large body of evidence of a conflicting character was given on this subject. Many medical and other witnesses stated that the habitual use of opium in any form for other than medical purposes is decidedly deleterious. Note Q.

Other witnesses, including a majority of the official doctors, deny that there are any evil consequences from opium-eating in moderation, some maintaining that it produces no evil effects and others alleging that it is actually beneficial.

Allusion has already been made (paragraph 25) to the controversy as to the value of Opium as a prophylactic against malarial fever. Copious references to important medical evidence will be found in the Notes, showing that this prophylactic theory is an entirely new one; not taught in the medical schools; never heard of by many practitioners; that opium is not used or recommended by many of those who have heard of the theory; that many practitioners who profess to believe in it prefer other remedies; that other practitioners, both pro-opiumists and anti-opiumists, deny altogether that opium does possess any such prophylactic properties; and that vast numbers of the people have no knowledge of or belief in opium as a preventive of fever. Note Y.

It is incredible that if the highest medical and other authorities in India seriously believed in this prophylactic use of opium that they should have allowed so many members of the medical service to remain in ignorance of it. The opinion of the Govern-

ment of Madras was indicated when a complaint was made that they were teaching the people of certain tracts to rely on opium as a febrifuge, for they replied that so far from that "we are doing all "we can to gradually wean them from their hereditary habit of "using it on all occasions."

"Consumption of Opium in India," C. — 6562, 1892, p. 52.

It is admitted on both sides that habitual consumers, who are unable to get the usual dose at the usual hour (*e*), besides suffering pain and inconvenience, are for a time incapacitated wholly or partly for the discharge of their ordinary duties.

(*e*) 2173-6, 12,902, 20,331, 23,606, 27,916, and many others.

Moral Effects of the Habitual Use of Opium.

33. As to the moral effects there is the same diversity in the evidence, for while a large number of witnesses declare that the use of the drug is detrimental morally, leading to idleness, inactivity, weakening of control over the will, and bad habits generally, other witnesses maintain that in their experience these results have not been observable.

Note R.

It is obvious that the positive testimony of those who have witnessed the evil of which they speak is not displaced by the evidence of any number of witnesses who have not observed the injurious effects of the drug on other people. It is admitted on all hands that the opium habit obtains an imperious sway over those who become subject to it. It is surely playing with words to contend that a mastery so powerful is not lowering to the moral nature of man.

Social Effects.

Note S.

34. Violent crimes are not attributed to opium, but there was a good deal of evidence that there is, in the case of the habitual consumer, an imperious craving for the periodical dose which constantly leads him, when he is poor, to resort to petty thefts in order to obtain money for the purpose of getting opium.

This allegation again was denied by certain Government witnesses, but we had no evidence that it is the practice to inquire into the original cause of petty theft; indeed one witness distinctly stated that it was not.

8770.

Other Considerations.

10,868, 4200, 4235, 12,391-2, 26,770, 19,331, 27,102, 23,511, 25,954, 27,569, 28,114.

35. It is universally admitted, even by pro-opium witnesses, that the injurious effects of opium appear much sooner and more markedly in the case of the poor than of the rich, because the latter are able to provide themselves with abundance of good and rich food, which appears to counteract the action of the opium.

Note T.

Nor is it denied by pro-opium witnesses that excessive use produces evil results both physical and moral. It is clear from the evidence that the excessive use is largely a matter of time,

because as soon as a moderate dose fails in its effect, as it usually does sooner or later, the quantity must be increased.

The fact of this tendency to increase the dose was attested by the evidence of a large number of witnesses on both sides. The anti-opium witnesses were practically unanimous on this point, and were supported by not a few of those who defended the practice of eating opium. But other pro-opium witnesses denied this tendency to increase beyond a given point. How this point is to be determined, except indeed by dangerous experiment, was not explained.

5832, 8805, 15,145, 17,177, 19,032, 25,522, 2151, 25,960, 26,613, and many others.

12,484, 15,912, 19,228.

The difficulty of discontinuance or even diminution of the habitual dose becomes greater in proportion to the length of the period of indulgence, until at last cessation becomes almost impossible.

Note U.

Comparative Effects of Opium on Natives of Europe and of India.

36. The question has been raised as to whether the consumption of opium is a matter of race, whether there is any reason why opium is consumed more in the East than in the West, and whether there is any difference in the tolerance (to use the medical term) of the inhabitants of Europe and of India.

The evidence presented to us shows that if there be any difference, Europeans possess greater tolerance.

Note V.

Indian Missionary Opinion.

37. In some Christian denominations in India there is actual prohibition, and in others a general understanding against the admission into church membership of converts who indulge in opium. This fact is strong proof of the sincerity of the opinions of the missionaries of those denominations, for it is obviously not to their interest to unduly restrict the number of their converts, and it is clear that they would not do it but for substantial reasons.

2302-4. 23,329.

Several memorials were forwarded to the Commission from missionaries and others interested in mission work. Some of them (*a*) expressed strong views against the use of opium and the present opium system, these views being supported by some of the signatories appearing personally as witnesses. Other memorials (*b*) took a less unfavourable view, and it is important to observe that none of those who signed these latter memorials offered themselves as witnesses, and consequently were not subjected to any examination of their views and means of knowledge.

(*a*) Vol. II., p. 314. Vol. II., p. 460. Vol. V., p. 137.

(*b*) Vol. II., p. 438. Vol. V., p. 138.

Of the 45 missionaries and others closely associated with them who appeared before us as witnesses, and submitted to the test of cross-examination, 41 (*c*) condemned the use of opium, two (*d*) may be said to have occupied neutral or indefinite positions, and

(*c*) 2238, 2589, 2756, 6921, 11,015, 13,988, 21,382, 21,463, 23,308, 23,332, 23,456, 25,521, 26,434, 26,539, 27,822, 4278, 7739, 10,611, 19 894, 21,297, and 21 others.

(*d*) 8652, 17,246.

(e) 5457, 16,902. two others, (e) one of whom declared himself an "abolitionist on "purely moral grounds," to some extent defended or at least extenuated the use of opium.

See also Vol. I., Q. 26.

Recommendation as to the Prohibition or Restriction of the General Use of Opium.

38. The balance of evidence shows that the non-medical use of opium is usually injurious to the consumer, and I am of opinion that much may be done to discourage the common use of the drug.

Note V. V. The Minutes of Evidence contain a large body of testimony showing that prohibition or restriction would be approved by the mass of the people in many parts of India. More than a hundred witnesses (three-fourths of whom were natives of India) were in favour of prohibition, in addition to a number of others who desired some form of restriction, short of prohibition.

The difficulties in the way of any further restriction propounded by some of the witnesses appear to me greatly exaggerated.

It is contended that, were further restriction attempted, it would be impossible, except in the large towns, to find persons to whom the sale for medicinal purposes could be entrusted. But the

Vol. II., pp. 427 and 467. present regulations authorise the issue of druggist's and doctor's licenses, and these are granted to hakims and vaids practising

Vol. II., p. 429. eastern systems of medicine. In Bengal alone, 1,264 of these licenses were issued in 1892-3.

As the people of India are in the main abstainers from the drug, and its consumption is not general, except in certain districts, some form of local veto on the common sale, ought, I think, to be adopted. It might also with great advantage and with popular approval be made applicable to alcohol.

I would further recommend a change of system by which the present opium contractors or vendors, who profit directly in proportion to the amount of opium they sell, should be replaced by official vendors, with fixed salaries.

So far from having any inducement to push the sale of the drug they should be directed, as far as possible, to discourage the non-medicinal use, and regulations should be laid down authorising them to refuse to supply persons whose relatives or friends complain that it is improperly used. All opium sold should be labelled "Poison," as in England, and should be accompanied by a caution, printed in the vernacular and in English, against its use for non-medical purposes. These official vendors would usually be natives of India, on moderate salaries. They should be located in places suitable for supplying the legitimate medicinal requirements of the people and be vigilantly supervised.

The alterations suggested, if properly carried out, would un-

doubtedly be an important step towards the reduction of the consumption.

RECOMMENDATION AS TO PROHIBITION OF OPIUM SMOKING.

39. Although very diverse views were laid before the Commission as to the habitual use of opium by eating and drinking, there was a striking consensus of disapproval of smoking as an injurious and degrading practice. Not only did the anti-opium witnesses attribute the worst effects of opium to the habit of smoking, but practically the whole of the witnesses who justified or palliated the practice of habitually eating moderate quantities emphatically condemned smoking in all its forms, as being unquestionably injurious and pernicious, and constituting a low and vicious habit. 2761, 3510, 4921, 5001, 5913, 3843, 6341, 10,840, 14,228, 15,723, 19,594, 19,757, 20,047, 25,288, 28,025, 4448, 21,590, 21,812, 21,655, 26,271, 14,416, 16,009, 16,688, 17,422-3, 18,536-8, 22,033, 26,057, 21,870.

Most of these pro-opium witnesses were in favour of further reduction of the facilities for smoking, and some of them approved of its total prohibition.

Surgeon Lieut.-Colonel Crombie said :— 3529.

"I think there is a consensus of opinion among all, including "opium-smokers themselves, that the chandu and madak manu-"factures should be abolished."

The Hon. A. Cadell, member of the Revenue Board, North-West Provinces and Oudh, while approving of opium eating, said :— 19,097.

"Opium-smokers are, if belonging to the upper classes, 19,098.
"debauchees, and if belonging to the lower classes, disreputable "persons, with a tendency to crime, caused not by any tendency "of opium in that direction, but by the irresistible character of "the vice and by the necessity felt to gratify a vice which is an "expensive one. . . . There is also a general feeling among "the more respectable classes against opium smoking."

See Note W. NOTE W.

40. Regarding the evidence on this particular subject as remarkably distinctive in its unanimity and conclusiveness, I consider that nothing short of absolute prohibition will satisfy the requirements of the case. The only proper action of the Government in accordance with public opinion should clearly be—

I. To discontinue all licenses in respect to preparations of opium for smoking.

II. To make unlawful—

(*a*) the manufacture, sale, purchase, or possession of chandu, madak, and other preparations of opium for smoking purposes;

(*b*) the manufacture, sale, purchase, or possession of materials, utensils, or apparatus for making or smoking such preparations of opium;

(*c*) the association of two or more persons at any place for

the purpose of smoking opium or any such preparations.

The administration and enforcement of such a law prescribing proper penalties for breaches thereof ought to be easy and effectual, for the evidence of any actual offence must be readily obtainable.

The fear has been expressed that a prohibitory measure of this character would open the way to inquisitorial and domiciliary visits by the police, and their possible bribery by the more influential and wealthy opium-smokers. But the existing law is similarly open to be used in an objectionable way, and absolute prohibition is not liable to any greater objections than those which apply to more partial and inadequate measures of repression.

Burma.

41. The case of Burma is exceptional and must be referred to separately.

6658, 6691, 6777-8, 7585, 8341-2. Most of the British officials in Burma have frankly recognised the evil effects of the consumption of opium in that country, as well as the practically unanimous opinion of the Burmese people against its public sale, and notwithstanding serious revenue considerations, have strongly advised restriction or prohibition. The Government of India has yielded slowly and apparently with reluctance to the advice given by its own officers in Burma, and

II., p. 354, pp. 463-79. to representations made from Great Britain. New regulations came into force on the 1st January, 1894. As a general rule the possession of opium, except for medical purposes, is now forbidden to Burmans. This rule is absolute in Upper Burma. In Lower Burma natives were allowed some months during which they might register themselves as consumers, and thus become entitled

6659, 8021. Vol. II., p. 537, par. 5. Vol. II., p. 545, par. 26. Vol. II., p. 635, Rules 23, 24. to purchase opium. The desire of the authorities in Burma that registration should be made compulsory for foreigners as well as for Burmans ought, in my opinion, to be acceded to. In some districts the sale of the drug to foreigners and registered Burmans is still in the hands of farmers. In other districts a system of retail sale by official vendors is being tried. This will, I think, be found to be a distinct improvement upon the old system of licensed shops. In every other practical way the consumption of opium should be restricted to the legitimate medical requirements of the people.

Sir David Barbour, in speaking of the special measures which had been taken to check the consumption of opium in provinces

2108. where its use was believed to be excessive (including Burma), said "I am not at all sure now that those measures have not been "carried too far, but they have been adopted to a great extent in "deference to English public opinion."

The whole history of the sale of the drug in Burma under

British rule; of the protests of the people of that country against it; and of the reluctance of the Indian Government to listen to their entreaties, furnishes, in my opinion, most powerful testimony to the need and to the value of the expression of English public opinion in these matters. Vol. II., p. 650, par. 7.

The Burmans are clearly entitled to demand that their wishes should be respected, and their right to the protection they have so long asked for should be fully recognised.

Malwa Opium.

42. The term Malwa Opium is employed to describe the opium produced in the Native States in the west of India, either for consumption in India or export from the port of Bombay.

A great part of this opium is produced in the ill-defined tract of land known as Malwa, comprising several Native States, the soil and climate of which are said to be specially favourable to the growth of poppy.

The extension of British territory in India has been so managed as to cut off the poppy-growing States from communication with the sea; and the transit of opium through British territory has been prohibited, except under an elaborate arrangement of passes, granted by British officers on payment of a heavy duty, and by certain duly authorised routes. This pass duty is not the subject of any agreements or treaty stipulations, but is imposed at the will and pleasure of the paramount power. It was fixed on the 1st October, 1862, at Rs. 600; was raised on the 16th July, 1877, to Rs. 650; on the 15th September, 1879, to Rs. 700; on the 28th June, 1882, it was reduced to Rs. 650; on the 5th July, 1890, further reduced to Rs. 600; and on the 1894, was raised to Rs. 650. The amounts realised from this source, together with the quantity of opium, are as follows:— Vol. II., p. 347.

Average of 3 years.	Rx.	Chests.	Duty per Chest. Rs.
1883-84 to 1885-86... ...	2,498,455	41,008	650
1890-91 to 1892-93... ...	1,753,110	32,510	600

Vol. II., pp. 342 and 347.

These figures are in part taken from a table which will be found in Vol. II., p. 347, which shows that while the quantity of opium exported from Bombay has been considerably declining, that which is diverted for local consumption has been somewhat increasing.

The Native States.

43. No good purpose would be served by a detailed statement of the treaties and agreements made in regard to opium with the

numerous Native States. They are described in App. X., Vol. II. By pressure, which they were not in a position to resist, most of these States have been induced to consent to arrangements the aim of which has been to safeguard and increase the revenue which the East India Company and the Indian Government have obtained from opium. In many cases it has been arranged that the rulers of Native States shall prohibit the cultivation of the poppy, and so regulate the traffic in opium as to increase the revenue of the State at the expense of their subjects. There is no evidence that in any of these States compensation has ever been given to cultivators or traders whose interests have been interfered with.

1543. 2082. Vol. IV., p. 495. 20,794, 20,839. 22,201. Vol. IV., p. 117. 22,935. 16,265. 16,271.

44. As to the power to stop the transit of opium through British territory, Sir Lepel Griffin said, "Of course you can pro-hibit the export." Sir D. M. Barbour said, "I think the export "to China could practically be stopped," but he was confident smuggling into British territory could not. The Hon. W. Lee Warner, in his memorandum, lays down that "interference with "the internal affairs of Native States has been justified in the past, "either (*a*) when adopted in the interests of the States, or (*b*) "when adopted in the interests of the British Government." He marshals instances "under class (*a*)" into six recognised grounds, including "(vi.) to check offences against natural law or public "morality." The suppression of seizing people for sorcery, and abolition of suttee, are given as instances.* Mr. Warner holds that opium does not come under any of these heads. Colonel Trevor, agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana, was asked, "would not it be an injustice not to allow" the produce of the States to be transmitted through British territory, and replied, "I "do not quite see that. If you think a thing is bad, you are not "bound to give a passage through your territory."

45. Certain Native States, including such important ones as Indore, Baroda, and Bhopal, consider that interference or prohibition in regard to opium would be outside, or contrary to, treaty engagements. Some of the Sikh States, on the contrary, took a different position. General Sardar Ratan Singh, of the Jind State, said, "if the Government prohibits the use of opium in British "territory, similar orders could be issued in the Jind State." He was not sure whether such a thing would be viewed as interference.

---

* In India, as elsewhere, officials are too much disposed to dread reforms and innovations. The case of suttee affords an illustration. Hunter, in his Indian Empire, page 475, says: "In spite of strenuous opposition, both from "*Europeans and Natives*, Lord W. Bentinck carried a Regulation in Council "on the 4th of December, 1829, by which all who abetted suttee were declared "guilty of culpable homicide." Hunter also refers to other reforms which "were distasteful to the covenanted service, and to the officers of the Army," and adds that Lord Bentinck "was supported by the Court of Directors, and "by the Whig Government at home."

Lala Dewa Singh, of the Nabha State, was asked what compensation, if any, His Highness' State would be fairly entitled to in the event of prohibition, and replied, "As the prohibition is entirely "beneficial to the people, this State does not wish for any com- "pensation for the loss of revenue resulting from such prohibition." Pandit Sarup Narian, of the Faridkot State, gave a similar answer. 16,289. 16,372.

46. The fact that in the face of a greater falling off in the supplies of Malwa opium than of Bengal opium the Indian Government has, since the visit of the Commission, materially increased the payment to the Bengal cultivator and put an additional burden of duty on the Malwa produce, shows more clearly than any official evidence that the right of dealing at will with the export trade, Native as well as British, is quietly claimed and exercised by the paramount government.

47. It is not possible to treat the suggested claims for compensation placed before the Commission seriously. Though compiled at the instance of the Indian Government and revised by its political officers, they neither deserve respect nor criticism. A few illustrations must suffice. The Tonk State in claiming Rs. 132,900 for loss of land revenue, Rs. 59,919 for Customs revenue, and Rs. 94,600 for traders' profits, claims Rs. 104,030 for compensation for money lenders! One item in Colonel Abbott's summary is, "extra expense of living on account of great rise in price of opium" Rs. 489,873. Vol. IV., p. 394.

In the State of Bundi, the average out-turn for the 12 years ending 1892-3 is given at 1,007 maunds; for the last half of that period at 371 maunds. (In the last year it was only 93 maunds.) Yet compensation is claimed for an annual trade of 2,000 maunds, and Colonel Abbott reports that the "Political officer, Lieut.-Colonel Thornton . . . considers the Durbar's estimate of "the losses, direct and indirect, both to itself and its subjects, as "accurate as it is possible to make them under existing circum- "stances." 20,922. 20,945. Vol. IV., p. 395.

In the Central Provinces, Sailana claimed Rs. 160,475 for land revenue. Lieut.-Colonel Robertson estimates it at Rs. 60,000. The State claims Rs. 128,380 for cultivators. He reduces this to Rs. 40,000. Of Multhan the same officer writes, "Losses to "cultivators and traders were not given by the State, they were "assumed by me." Vol. IV., p. 407. Vol. IV., p. 407

It is clear that the evidence thus brought before us can be of no assistance if claims in equity should be seriously advanced by these States.

Conclusions.

48. The form of the questions submitted to the Commission makes it difficult to give categorical answers, but in reference to the paragraphs thereon, I reply:—

I.—(*a*) That the growth of the poppy and manufacture and sale of opium in British India should be prohibited, except for medical purposes.

(*b*) Such prohibition should not be forcibly imposed on the Native States, but the example of the British Government should be supported by such influence as may legitimately be employed.

II. The existing arrangements with the Native States in respect to the transit of opium through British territory depend absolutely on the will of the paramount power, and appear to have been dominated throughout by the financial policy of British India. When the Chinese trade from British India has been brought to an end, as I hold it certainly should be, and when licenses to cultivate are no longer granted, licenses for the transit of opium through British territory may justly be withheld.* There is no legal claim for compensation. Any equitable claims must be tested by further inquiry and reliable evidence.

III.—(*a*) There is no precedent for compensation to landlords or cultivators on the termination of opium cultivation, and there would be no claim for compensation for withholding further licenses.

(*b*) Adequate information was not placed before us as to the cost of additional preventive measures, but the general statements that were made appear greatly exaggerated.

NOTE X. (*c*) The revenue derivable from opium has been for some years declining, and can no longer be safely relied upon. (*See* Note X.)

IV.—It is desirable to replace the present opium contractors and vendors by official vendors, with instructions and discretion to restrict the sale. I recommend the entire prohibition of smoking.

V.—The consumption of opium obtains more or less extensively amongst the races and in the localities most fully represented before the Commission. Little or no evidence was tendered from large districts where its non-medical use is little known. It is clear that the Opium habit, so far from being common amongst the people generally, is relatively exceptional in British India. It is a vice in Calcutta and the large towns, but certainly not of the majority of the populations. It is common among the Rajputs, and to a less extent the Sikhs, but the sweeping statements made as to its

---

*Legitimate medical requirements are not here alluded to.

universal use by them are quite untenable. Women are seldom addicted to the habit. The moral effect is hurtful in tarnishing and weakening the will power of the user: the physical effect is generally injurious in proportion to the amount taken, and to the inability of the consumer to protect himself against it by plenty of good food.

VI.—(*a*) The people of India do not, so far as regards the greater part of that country, regard the use of opium for non-medical purposes favourably.

(*b*) The people of India maintain that they are already taxed to the very limit of their ability, and that they are unable and unwilling to submit to any additional burdens.

Serious consideration should promptly be given to the question of reducing the expenditure now borne by the people of India.

49. In these pages I have given my conclusions on the evidence presented to the Commission. As stated in a Memorandum accompanying this Dissent, I do not think that the whole of the facts were presented to us with the impartiality and completeness due to such an inquiry. The Report adopted by my colleagues appears to me to partake more of the character of an elaborate defence of the Opium trade of the East India Company, and of the present Government of India, than of a judicial pronouncement on the immediate questions submitted to us. On this ground also, as well as for the reasons already given, I am unable to join in it.

50. One of the last paragraphs in the Report (No. 274) refers to me, and includes the following sentence:—"We regret that in "the discussions which took place during the preparation of our "Report we were not placed in possession of the views of our "colleague."

It will be seen by a letter to the Chairman from myself, a copy of which is appended, that I was distinctly precluded by him from taking part in the discussions referred to. At the first subsequent meeting of the Commission, I referred to my letter, and to Lord Brassey's desire that I should refrain from discussion. Lord Brassey intimated that I had correctly stated his wishes. I do not therefore understand the propriety of this reflection, by the majority, on the course which I took at the Chairman's direct instance and request, with the concurrence of four other colleagues. NOTE Z.

18th March, 1895. HENRY J. WILSON.

APPENDIX

TO MR. WILSON'S DISSENT.

NOTE A. to par. 2.—RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS (30TH JUNE, 1893) WHICH LED TO THE APPOINTMENT OF THE COMMISSION.

"That having regard to the strong objections urged on moral grounds to the "system by which the Indian Opium Revenue is raised, this House presses on "the Government of India to continue their policy of greatly diminishing the "cultivation of the poppy and the production and sale of opium, and desires "that an humble address may be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her "Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to report as to :—

"1. Whether the growth of the poppy and manufacture and sale of opium "in British India should be prohibited except for medical purposes, "and whether such prohibition could be extended to the Native States.

"2. The nature of the existing arrangements with the Native States in "respect of the transit of Opium through British territory, and on "what terms, if any, these arrangements could be with justice "terminated.

"3. The effect on the finances of India of the prohibition of the sale and "export of opium, taking into consideration (*a*) the amount of com- "pensation payable; (*b*) the cost of the necessary preventive "measures; (*c*) the loss of revenue.

"4. Whether any change short of total prohibition should be made in the "system at present followed for regulating and restricting the opium "traffic, and for raising a revenue therefrom.

"5. The consumption of opium by the different races and in the different districts of India, and the effect of such consumption on the moral and physical condition of the people.

"6. The disposition of the people of India in regard to (*a*) the use of opium "for non-medical purposes; (*b*) their willingness to bear in whole or "in part the cost of prohibitive measures."

NOTE B. to par. 5.—OFFICIAL OPINION OF OPIUM.

Lieut.-Colonel James Tod, political agent to the Western Rajput States, in his work on the "Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan," written in 1820, published in 1832, writes :—

"This pernicious plant has robbed the Rajput of half his virtues." (Vol. I., p. 644.) . . .

"This drug, which has tended more to the physical and moral degradation "of the inhabitants than the combined influences of pestilence and war." (Vol. II., p. 630.)

"Execrable and demoralising plant" (poppy). (Vol. II., p. 634.)

Mr. C. A. Bruce, superintendent of the tea plantations in Assam (prior to 1840), refers to opium as the—

Hansard, vol. 68, p. 380.

"Dreadful plague which has depopulated this beautiful country . . .

"This vile drug has kept and does now keep down the population . . .

"Few but those who have resided long in this unhappy country know the "dreadful and immoral effects which the use of opium produces on the native."

Mr. A. Sym, 11 years in the opium district of Gorakhpur, and for a time in charge of the opium agency there, wrote in 1840 :—

Hansard, vol. 68, p. 382.

"The health and morals of the people suffer from the production of opium. "Wherever opium is grown it is eaten, and the more it is grown the more it is "eaten, . . . its pernicious effects are visible on the population of the opium

"districts, particularly in the neighbourhood of the depôts . . . One opium "cultivator demoralises a whole village."

A esolution by the Government of Bombay in 1881—

"Ordered that the following letter be addressed to the Government of "India :—

". . . on the question of the expediency of permitting the cultivation of "the poppy in Sind. . . .

"III. I am at the same time to state that this Government consider there "are very strong objections to the introduction of an industry so demoralising "in its tendency as opium cultivation and manufacture into a province where "it is at present unknown. . . . It has already been tried in Gujarat, and "the result was widespread corruption and demoralisation.

"At present the consumption of opium in this Presidency is very limited, "but if the cultivation of opium and manufacture of opium were permitted, "every village might have its opium shop, and every cultivator might contract "the habit of eating a drug which is said to degrade and demoralise those who "become addicted to it. On the ground of public morality, therefore, his "Excellency the Governor in Council would strongly deprecate the grant of "permission to cultivate the poppy in Sind, or in any other part of this "Presidency."

NOTE C. to par. 6.—SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE GROWTH OF POPPY AS IT AFFECTS THE INDIVIDUAL RYOT.

[The figures are not the same as in par. 6, because there the agencies are dealt with together, and here separately.]

In the Benares Agency.

In the month of September he proceeds to the head-quarters or weighment place of the district in which he lives, a distance, on the average, of about 20 miles, to receive license to cultivate a specified plot for the growth of the poppy, the plot being usually only a small portion of his farm or holding, averaging ·61 of a bigah, equal to ·38 of an acre, or 1,839 square yards. He receives at the same time the first advance of Rs. 3·66 (or, taking the rupee at 13d., 3s. 11½d.), being at the rate of Rs. 6 per bigah. Returning home, he prepares his ground and sows the poppy seed. Q. 2955. II., p. 320.

When the crop is a few inches above the ground he sometimes, not always, gets a further advance, not exceeding Rs. 1·22, or 1s. 3¾d., being at the rate of Rs. 2 per bigah. In February or March when the seed capsules or heads are formed, he lances or slits them, and carefully scrapes off the exuding juice or opium, which is preserved in earthen pots until April, when he again travels with it to the weighment place, where he delivers it to the officials of the Opium Department. II., 320.

The average weight received from each cultivator is 2·77 seers, or 5 lbs. 11·17 ozs., and the payment on account which he then receives averages, say, Rs. 7·93, or 8s. 7d.

The opium is then forwarded to the factory at Patna, in the case of the Behar Agency, or to Ghazipur in the case of the Benares Agency. The "consistence" or proportion of moisture in the opium is there ascertained. An account is made out, and in July or August the cultivator, travelling again as it appears to the weighment place, receives the balance due to him, averaging, say, Rs. 1·06, or 1s. 1¾d., the price being calculated at the rate of 5 Rs. per seer, equal to 2s. 4¾d. per lb. av. for opium of 70 degrees of "consistence." A somewhat higher or lower price will be paid in case it contains more or less than 30 per cent. of water. The total average amount paid to each ryot for opium is 15s.

In the Patna Agency.

In the Bihar or Patna Agency the ryot is in a worse position. He has to deliver his opium with 5 per cent. less moisture. Other arrangements of the

Agency are less favourable to him. The land is less productive. The total amount of opium he weighs in is only 4 lbs. 11·70 ozs., for which he receives only 12s. 5½d.

Vol. V., p. 5.

NOTE D. to par. 7.—EXTRACT FROM CORRESPONDENCE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE OPIUM DEPARTMENT.

par. 10.

"The railways and other means of communication which have been opened "out, and the ever growing demands of the commerce of the country, have "completely changed the state of affairs. Opium has lost its place as the most

par. 14.

"lucrative crop a cultivator can grow. . . . The Board are of opinion that "much may be done to improve the popularity of the opium cultivation.

par. 15.

". . . In conclusion I am to state that the policy the Board would "recommend may briefly be summarised as follow :—I. An adequate price to "be paid for crude opium, to be settled from time to time with reference to the "competition of other crops. . . . IV. Adequate salaries to be paid to "the native establishment and the abolition of all illegal gratification strictly "enforced."

(Letter from Officiating Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces, to the Secretary to the Government of Bengal, 19th January, 1884.)

NOTE E. to par. 7.—ON DIFFICULTY OF MAINTAINING POPPY CULTIVATION.

Mr. Kemble, opium agent, of Bihar, in his Annual Report of the Agency for the year 1890-91, says :—

"There can be no doubt that since the opening of the Bengal and North-"Western Railway the difficulty of maintaining the cultivation of such a "delicate crop as poppy has largely increased." (Par. 7.)

He adds that competition of other crops

"is becoming so keen that our department now have difficulty in maintaining "their position." (Par. 8.)

Mr. Rivett-Carnac, opium agent, Benares, in his Annual Report for 1890-91, speaks of certain districts where the cultivation of the poppy is popular, but of others where the cultivators have "for the present lost heart," and of other cultivators as "gradually withdrawing from the industry." (Par. 6.)

Similarly in his Report for the year 1891-92, Mr. Kemble (Bihar) says—

"We cannot be surprised at the disinclination generally of the cultivators to "take advances. . . . The other main cause which tended to reduce the "settlements was the difficulty in obtaining good lands for our cultivation, "owing to the competition of other crops." (Par. 8.)

He quotes Mr. Christian, an officer of long experience, as saying ,—

"The good lands are no longer under the poppy cultivation, but have either "gone to indigo or other better paying crops. The crops that are competing "with poppy, in fact, I ought to say, that have swamped and overcome it, are "tobacco, potato, haldi, chillies, and other garden produce." (Par. 9.)

In his Report for 1891-92 Mr. Rivett-Carnac again discusses the competition of other crops, but takes a less gloomy view of the prospects of the opium department, than his colleague, Mr. Kemble.

NOTE F. to par. 8.—OFFICIAL INQUIRIES ON COMPLAINTS OF COMPULSION (OR PERSUASION) IN REGARD TO THE CULTIVATION OF POPPY.

12,079.

In the first case referred to by Mr. Forbes, Mr. Lyon, settlement officer, had reported that certain officers had been bringing pressure to bear.

Vol. V., p. 357.

A deputy magistrate, Maulvi Syed Ali Hosain, who was directed to make an inquiry on the subject, gives the statements of a number of ryots.

"Bansi Mahton states: My brother is khattahdar of this village. His "name is Tulsi . . . the former zilladar (since transferred) induced us to

"cultivate poppy, and told us to try for this year. The land is not capable of "producing opium . . . he (the zilladar) took my brother to Hajipur; "my brother was unwilling to go, and he said that we would not grow "opium. . . . He (the zilladar) did not threaten us with punishment if "we did not grow, but he pressed us to do so by taking my brother to Hajipur "for receiving dadni (advance)."

Shaik Hidayat Ali, says that the Zilladar Rheda Bux—

"Insisted Tulsi to receive dadni (advance for poppy) . . . he stayed "three or four days to persuade us to grow opium . . . he did not beat "any of us . . . his fault was to compel khattahdar to receive advances, "we had since fear that if we did not cultivate we would be falsely proceeded "against by zilladar."

Gudri Mahton, referring to the zilladar, says :—

"I cannot say that he told each and every villager to grow opium, but he "did me."

Tulsi Mahton says :— Vol. V., p. 358.

"He (the zilladar) told me that we must grow opium. He advised us to "cultivate poppy, as we had no mind to grow this year. He said that I must "go to receive advances."

Other ryots made no complaints. Some said they cultivated willingly. It was suggested by them, or to them, that the zilladar stayed so long in the village because it was raining.

The Deputy Magistrate, reporting on the case, says :—

"What the zilladar seems to have done was that he insisted a little too "much upon the khattahdar to receive dadni (advances), and holding out good "hopes for the poppy growth owing to rains," and he points out "that there "was no kind of violence used by him in compelling them to grow opium.

It is instructive in the face of these statements that Mr. Hare in enclosing the report and depositions, says :—

"No touch or trace of any attempt at compulsion appears." Vol. V., p. 356.

Mr. Forbes in his letter says that—

"Market garden produce has admittedly of late years begun to compete Vol. V., p. 355. "successfully with opium. Cases of this kind must therefore be expected to "occur."

This seems to show that compulsion, which is called in India "persuasion," is expected as a matter of course.

The Second Case referred to by Mr. Forbes.

Rai Jai Prakash Lal Bahadur, C.I.E., dewan (chief officer) of the Dumraon Raj, was interviewed on the 28th and 29th of August, 1893, by Mr. Christian sub-deputy opium agent of Shahabad, and Mr. Sen, assistant sub-deputy agent, in reference to the "reluctance of the cultivators to engage the full area" desired or required by the Opium Department. It was arranged that the dewan was— Vol. V., p. 359.

"To use his influence with some of the ryots of the Raj to induce them to Vol. V., p. 355. "continue the cultivation . . . by using influence he only meant persua- "sion; that he had merely asked the ryots of certain villages for his sake to "try cultivation for one year (this year) longer, and that they had consented "to do so."

It is further explained that this influence or persuasion was exercised by a circular letter issued to the tahsildars of the Raj, directing them to use their endeavours to help poppy cultivation.

A copy of this circular has been asked for, but has not yet been produced.

It appears further that Mr. Christian had a conversation himself with one of Vol. V., p. 359

these tahsildars, who explained "the kind of help given by the Raj." So far as I understand, it amounts to this: that land was to be taken from one man and given to another for opium, if he would grow poppy; that if one man possessed a well another was to be allowed to take water from it to grow poppy, and that rent was to be reduced by the middleman to a ryot who would grow poppy.

Vol. V., p. 355, par. 4. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the dewan was, as Mr. Forbes states, unwilling to give evidence. His position was extremely embarrassing.

Vol. V., p. 372. Mr. Dane says that the dewan "attended at Bankipur on the first day that "the Commission sat there" (January 3rd). If this means that he was present

Vol. V., p. 355, par. 5. at the sitting and was ready to be called it does not accord with Mr. Forbes' statement.

Mr. Dane and Mr. Forbes agree that this important witness was present on a later date (January 6th). On neither occasion was his presence known to the Commission generally. It was most important that he should be heard, and no explanation has been given as to why any member of the Commission was kept in ignorance of his presence.

The Third Case referred to by Mr. Forbes.

Vol. V., p. 360. Mr. F. H. B. Skrine, collector of Shahabad, and subsequently of Bhagalpur, had an interview about the middle of August, 1893, with Mr. Christian, sub-deputy opium agent, already referred to, who desired—

"My co-operation in restoring the area under poppy to its normal. He told "me that . . . the opium agent of Behar, had instructed him to consult "me on the subject."

Mr. Skrine undertook to issue a circular, but delayed it for about a fortnight, when he was reminded of his promise by Mr. N. C. Sen, assistant sub-deputy agent. He says:—

Vol. V., p. 361. "Thereupon I addressed a circular . . . to the sub-divisional officers of "Bhabua, Buxar, and Sasaram, and the manager of D. & D. Kumar's Ward "Estate, in which I informed them that it was the policy of the Government "to extend opium cultivation in wards and Government estates. I asked them "to give the sub-deputy opium agent a list of villages in their charge which "contained land suitable for sowing opium, and to instruct their tahsildars to "use their utmost efforts, in co-operation with the sub-deputy opium agent, to "induce our ryots to take opium advances."

Vol. V., p. 361. Mr. Skrine, being called to account, makes various statements in palliation of his conduct, which he does not attempt to defend, and Mr. Commissioner Forbes admits that—

Vol. V., p. 356. "Things were pushed further than they ought to have been." Mr. Skrine's orders being "such as I should certainly not have approved had they come to "my notice; nor are they warranted, so far as I am aware, by any instructions "that have ever been issued by Government or by the Board of Revenue."

Note G. to par. 10.—Potatoes uprooted at Barni, near Patna.

On the 19th December, 1893, Mr. Gennoe, assistant sub-deputy opium agent, destroyed a plot of potatoes at the village of Barni, near Bankipore, on the allegation of a zilladar that this was land on which the cultivator had engaged

12,396 to 12,454. to grow opium. Evidence to this effect was given before us on the 6th January, 1894, by my son and Mr. Gupta.

On the same day we were informed by Mr. Tytler, sub-deputy opium agent, in the presence of Mr. Forbes, the Commissioner of Patna, Mr. Rivett-Carnac,

12,269. opium agent at Benares, and other officials, that it is not lawful under any circumstances to pull up the crops.

Vol. V., p. 140. At the request of the Commission a further inquiry was subsequently made, and the report of this inquiry has been forwarded to us since our return from

India. The report shows that as a matter of fact the cultivator had committed no offence whatever. Mr. Wace says :—

"I have very little doubt that he lost his potatoes because he did not fee "the zilladar."

The Assistant Sub-Deputy Agent attempted, in a letter sent by him to Mr. Wace, to justify his action by reference to a rule and a form in the Opium Manual. Mr. Wace points out that the rule does not cover this case, that the form is irrelevant, and that the official in question had not availed himself of an opportunity given him to produce witnesses on his own behalf. Vol. V., p. 142. Vol. V., p. 141. Vol. V., p. 142.

NOTE H. to par. 15.—CONDEMNATION OF OPIUM BY ENGLISH OFFICIALS RESIDENT IN CHINA AND JAVA.

Sir George Staunton, who was in China from 1792 to 1816, referred to opium as "an article of vicious luxury," and said :—

"The best lands of India might have been made to produce that which was "beneficial to man, instead of being devoted to the cultivation of such a "pernicious article." Hansard, 1840, vol. 53, p. 743.

Sir Stamford Raffles, who died in 1826, said :—

"The use of opium, it must be confessed and lamented, has struck deep into "the habits, and extended its malignant influence to the morals of the people, "and is likely to perpetuate its power in degrading their character and ener- "vating their energies, as long as the European Government, overlooking "every consideration of policy and humanity, shall allow a paltry addition to "their finances to outweigh all regard to the ultimate happiness and prosperity "of the country."

Mr. Montgomery Martin, Colonial Treasurer at Hong Kong, refers to opium as—

"Desolating China, corrupting its Government, and bringing the fabric of "that extraordinary Empire to a state of more rapid dissolution." Report H. of C. on China Trade, 1847.

Sir Harry Parkes refers to opium as "a baneful article."—See his life by Stanley Lane Poole, Vol. I., p. 421.

Mr. L. E. Oxenham, late British Consul in China, says :—

"Do the Chinese, . . . desire the continuation of the trade now? "Would the Chinese Parliament vote for such a traffic? No one with any "knowledge of China would answer in the affirmative. The opium is equally "denounced by the Government, by the Confucian literati, and by the "Buddhist and Taoist priesthood."—"Society of Arts Journal," April, 1892, p. 485. Society of Arts Journal, 1892, p. 485.

NOTE J. to par 15.—CHINESE OFFICIAL CONDEMNATION OF OPIUM.

Sir Robert Hart, G.C.M.G., who is in the service of the Chinese Government as Director of Customs, in the special report on opium issued in 1881, said :—

"Chinese who have studied the opium question are opposed to a traffic "which more or less harms smokers. . . . They do not find in . . . "the revenue produced . . . any sufficient reason for welcoming the "growth of the trade, or for desisting from the attempt to check the consump- "tion of opium."

The Chinese Foreign Office wrote to Sir Rutherford Alcock in July, 1869 :—

"That opium is like a deadly poison, that it is most injurious to mankind. ". . . The officials and people of this Empire . . . all say that "England trades in opium because she desires to work China's ruin, for (say "they) if the friendly feelings of England are genuine, since it is open to her "to produce and trade in everywhere else, would she still insist on spreading "the poison of this hurtful thing through the Empire?" East Indian Finance Committee, 1871.

Sir Rutherford Alcock, at that time Her Majesty's Minister at Pekin, said in reference to this :—

"He had no doubt that the abhorrence expressed by the Government and "people of China for opium was genuine and deep-seated."

In a letter in the "Times" of July 29th, 1881, Li Hung Chang, then Grand Secretary and Viceroy of China, said :—

"I may assert here once for all that the single aim of my Government in "taxing opium, will be in the future, as in the past, to repress the traffic . . . "never to desire to gain revenue from such a source."

"China, Commercial and Social," vol. II., p. 187.

Mr. Montgomery Martin, Colonial Treasurer of Hong-Kong, states that the Emperor of China had remarked :—

"It is true I cannot prevent the introduction of the flowing poison. Gain-"seeking and corrupt men will for profit and sensuality defeat my wishes, "but nothing will induce me to derive a revenue from the vice and misery of "my people."

NOTE K. to par. 15.—CONDEMNATION OF OPIUM BY MISSIONARIES IN CHINA.

The Rev. Dr. Medhurst, one of the earliest missionaries of the London Missionary Society, which was the first Protestant Society to enter China, in his "China" (London, 1838), says :—

"Those who have not seen the effects of opium-smoking in the eastern "world, can hardly form any conception of its injurious results on the health, "energies, and lives of those who indulge in it. . . . In proportion as "the wretched victim comes under the power of the infatuating drug, so is "his ability to resist temptation less strong, and debilitated in body as well as "mind he is unable to earn his usual pittance, and not infrequently sinks under "the craving of an appetite which he is unable to gratify. . . . Those who "grow and sell the drug, while they profit by the speculation, would do well "to follow the consumer into the haunts of vice, and mark the wretchedness, "poverty, disease, and death which follow the indulgence, for if they did but "know the thousandth part of the evils resulting from it they would not, they "could not, continue to engage in the transaction."

Vol. I., p. 33.

Numerous testimonies were communicated to the Commission by the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and by the Secretary of the China Inland Mission, all testifying to the evil effects of opium.

Vol. I., p. 39.

Vol. V., p. 353.

See also an important memorial signed by 17 Chinese Missionaries of all denominations (including two Bishops), and all of more than 25 years' standing in China.

NOTE L. to par. 20.—QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES AS TO ALLEGED EXTENSIVE USE OF OPIUM AND POLITICAL DANGER FROM INTERFERENCE.

Sir Joseph Fayrer, K.C.S.I., M.D., says :—

1637. "It is well known that over large areas of country in India, by tens of "thousands of people, opium in moderation is habitually used by the natives."

Dr. K. C. Bose, President of the Calcutta Medical Society, says :—

3774. "Amongst the permanent residents of Calcutta only 10 per cent. of the "people actually take Opium, whilst amongst those who come from other "portions of the country nearly 20 per cent. use opium in some shape or other."

Rai Sheo Bux Bogla Bahadur, merchant and banker, representing the National Chamber of Commerce, says :—

6047. "About 70 or 80 per cent. of both Rajputs and Sikhs" take opium as a daily ration.

Surgeon-Colonel Cleghorn, M.D., Inspector-General of Civil Hospitals in the Punjab, says :—

16,849. "I fancy that about 50 or 75 per cent. of the inhabitants of Lucknow take "Opium."

Mr. J. J. S. Driberg, Excise Commissioner of Assam, says :—

"Bearing in mind the conditions of the climate, and the fact that opium "has been consumed in the Province from time immemorial, so that it has "now become a necessity of life, it is certain that any attempt to stop con- "sumption, or even to limit or reduce it, more than has been done in the past "ten years, would have a disastrous effect on the physical condition of the "people." 9019.

"Then you say that stopping it would depopulate whole tracts?—Yes." 9583.

Sir Charles Crosthwaite, K.C.I.E., Lieut.-Governor of the North-West Provinces and Oudh, says :—

"There is no doubt that the people use opium very largely, not in great "quantities, but very widely. I think nearly all of them give it to their "children, and believe that it is necessary. . . 14,813.

"My opinion is that we could not actually prohibit the use of opium except "for medical purposes without a very large and oppressive force, and without "an inquisition into the habits of the people, which would be very unpleasant "to them, and would make the Government, I think, exceedingly unpopular." 14,798.

The Hon. D. R. Lyall, C.S.I., Member of the Board of Revenue, Lower Provinces, says :—

"I hold that, in a political point of view, total prohibition would be so "dangerous, and would alienate so large a body of Her Majesty's subjects in "India, as to be impossible. . . . The dissatisfaction would be enormous, "and I am not prepared to say that, fanned as it would be by professional "agitators, it would not amount to disaffection, and require the presence of "more British troops in India." 3191.

The Hon. T. D. Mackenzie, Commissioner of Customs, Salt, Opium, and Abkari, Bombay, says :—

"In my opinion to prohibit the sale of opium in British India, except for "medical purposes, would be to invite a general rising all over the country "against what would be regarded, and, in my mind, justly regarded as cruel "and causeless oppression." 26,149.

See also *Q.* 4999, 6059, 14,059, 15,700, 15,703, 19,530, 20,425, 27,029, 27,036, &c.

NOTE M. to par. 21.—AVERAGE OF OPIUM TAKEN BY ADULT MALE CONSUMERS.

The analysis of the evidence of 85 witnesses shows that :—

				Grains.
The average of what 31 witnesses consider strictly moderate use is ...				7·77
,, ,, 34 ,,	customary use ...	...		15·12
,, ,, 20 ,,	excessive use ...	...		41·00
Thus the 85 witnesses give a gross average of		...	...	18·53

But we have more precise information from three medical witnesses :—

			Grains.	
Average of Dr. Huntly's record of	100 cases	=	20·89	Vol. IV., p. 404.
,, Surg.-Lt.-Col. Hendley's record of	4,409 ,,	=	21·5	Vol. IV., p. 381.
,, Dr. Ram Roy's record of... ...	215 ,,	=	26·4	Vol. II., p. 425.
Gross average of	4,724 ,,	=	21·7	

In view of these figures, it will probably be pretty near the mark to take 20 grains as the fair average daily consumption of each adult male consumer; and that this is not, in the opinion of the authorities, an unreasonable or excessive allowance is clear from the fact that 20 grains is the authorised ration to soldiers on service, and the further fact that in Burma 45 grains a day appears to be the official estimate for each smoker. Vol. II., App. XXVII., p. 452, 6510-3.

NOTE N. TO PAR. 21.—Table showing Consumption of Opium by Provinces.

Columns 2 to 6 are to be found in official statements; Columns 7 to 11 are calculations therefrom.

In order of Col. 9.	Province.	Area.	Population. (1891).	In 1892-93.		To each Shop.		Annual Consumption of Opium per Head.	Daily Dose for 1 per cent. of Population.	Consumption is equal to 20 grains daily to One Person out of
				Shops.	Amount of Opium issued.	Area.	Population.			
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
		Sq. Miles.			Lbs.	S. Miles.		Grs.	Grs.	
1	Assam - - -	49,004	5,476,833	882	109,741	55	6,209	141	38·6	52
2	Berar - - -	17,718	2,897,491	478	37,876	37	6,062	91	24·9	80
3	Bombay - -	77,275	15,985,270	845	108,980	91	18,918	47	12·9	155
4	Sindh - - -	47,789	2,871,774	300	18,052	159	9,572	44	12·3	166
5	Punjab - - -	110,667	20,860,913	1,780	125,292	62	11,158	42	11·5	174
6	Central Province -	*81,300	*10,046,540	†1,663	52,248	58	6,041	34	9·3	214
7	N.W. Provinces -	83,286	342,54,254	853	74,984	97	40,157	24	6·6	304
8	Oudh - - -	24,217	12,650,831	188	27,217	129	67,291	15	4·1	486
9	Bengal - - -	151,543	71,346,987	‡2,095	159,171	73	34,056	15	4·1	486
10	Madras - - -	141,189	35,630,440	§1,034	119,470	136	34,459	14	3·8	521
	Total - -	783,988	212,021,333	10,118	833,031	—	—	—	—	—
	Average of British India - - -					77	20,955	27	7·4	270
	Bengal (excluding Calcutta) - -							12⅓	3·4	589

* Excluding Proprietory Estates. † Including 518 temporary Licenses, ‡ Excluding 1,264 druggists' Licenses. § Including 20 poppy-head Licenses,

NOTE O. TO PAR. 21.

Table showing Extremes of Large and Small Consumption in Selected Localities.

Province.	District.	Reference		Population.	In 1892-3.			In 1892-3.			To each Shop.			
		Vol.	Page.		No. of Shops.	Amount sold.		Annual Consumption per head.	Daily Dose for 1 per cent. Population.	Consumption is equal to 20 grains daily to one person out of	Population.	Yearly Amount sold.	Amount sold Daily (365 Days per Annum).	
													Oz. av.	No. of 20 Grain doses.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
						Maund s. c.	lbs.	Grs.	Grs.			lbs. oz.		
Bengal ...	Calcutta ...	II.	434	874,450	101	419 9 0	34,493	276·14	75·6	26	8,658	341 8	14·42	315
„ ...	Jessore ...	„	„	1,888,827	51	24 7 0	1,989	7·37	2·0	990	37,036	37 0	1·62	35
„ ...	Dacca (Div.)	„	„	9,844,127	188	92 27 0	7,625	5·42	1·5	1,347	52,363	40 9	1·77	39
„ ...	Tippera ...	„	„	1,782,935	7	2 26 0	218	·85	·2	8,588	254,705	31 2	1·36	30
Bombay ...	Ratnagiri ...	IV.	280-1	997,090	8	—	272	1·91	·5	3,822	124,636	34 0	1·49	33
„ ...	Broach ...	„	„	326,930	50	—	8,762	187·61	51·4	39	6,538	175 4	7·68	118
Central ...	Damon ...	„	521	325,613	—	6 30 11	557	11·97	3·3	610	—	—	—	—
„ ...	Wardha ...	„	„	400,854	—	49 19 14	4,073	71·12	19·4	102	—	—	—	—
N.W.P. ...	Ballia ...	V.	93	942,465	—	2 27 0	220	1·63	·4	4,478	—	—	—	—
„ ...	Benares ...	„	„	921,943	—	140 14 0	11,548	87·69	24·0	83	—	—	—	—
Oudh ...	Hardoi ...	„	„	1,113,211	—	14 8 0	1,168	7·35	2·0	993	—	—	—	—
„ ...	Lucknow ...	„	„	774,163	—	143 24 0	11,815	106·84	29·2	68	—	—	—	—
						Seers.								
Punjab ...	Jhang ...	„	119	436,841	39	192	395	6·33	1·7	1,153	11,201	10 2	·44	10
„ ...	Ludhiana ...	„	„	648,722	105	7,966	16,386	176·82	48·4	41	6,178	156 1	6·84	150

NOTE P. to par. 26.—ON LICENTIOUS PURPOSE FOR WHICH OPIUM IS CONSUMED.

Numerous witnesses declared that a special purpose for which opium is taken is for prolonging sexual indulgence.

Dr. Mahendra Lal Sircar, C.I.E., says :—

6327. "The chief of these pleasures which allures men to the use of the drug is "what I may call sexual endurance.

6334. "They (smokers) told me that this invariably was the origin of . . . the "pernicious habit."

Assistant-Surgeon Shah, Chief Medical Officer of Junagadh State, says :—

24,119. "Opium is commenced for sexual enjoyment."

Mr. Jagat Narian, B.A., pleader of Lucknow, says :—

15,672. "It is taken for immoral purposes by 80 per cent. of the opium-eaters here."

See also 2594, 12,654, 13,994, 18,210, 26,286, 26,542, and many others.

General Sardar Ratan Singh, member of the Council of Regency of the Jind State, says :—

16,262. "Those who commenced the use of opium for the sake of pleasure in their "youth are looked down upon by society, and are considered as using it for "licentiousness."

See also 18,313, 2594, 18,264.

NOTE Q. to par. 32.—QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES AS TO INJURIOUS PHYSICAL EFFECTS OF OPIUM.

Rai Lal Madhub Mookerjee, Bahadur, L.M.S., President of the Calcutta Medical School, says :—

8805. "It produces slow, steady, and certain degeneration of the human system, "abundantly evidenced by the digestive disorders and emaciation that attend "its use."

Nil Ratan Sircar, M.A., M.D., Fellow of the Calcutta University, Lecturer on Forensic Medicine in the Calcutta Medical School, says :—

5833. "The power of resistance of disease generally becomes diminished, and the "opium-eater becomes pre-disposed to some diseases ; for example, cold, "bronchitis, diarrhœa, dysentery, and dyspepsia."

Mr. Isan Chandra Roy, M.B., says :—

13,099. "The attenuated body, the peculiar withered and blasted countenance, with "a characteristic gait, will reveal the opium-eater at a glance. His digestive "organs become highly disordered, and he scarcely eats anything. His "mental and bodily powers are destroyed. In fact he becomes impotent."

The Rev. Colin S. Valentine, LL.D., L.R.C.P., and L.R.C.S.E., &c., Principal of the Agra Medical Missionary Training Institute, when asked, "What are the results of the habit, physical, mental, and moral?" replied :—

19,907. "Deterioration in all three points. The appetite is taken away, the "digestion is impaired, there is congestion of the various internal organs, "congestion of the lungs, constipation and diarrhœa consequent upon it, pains "all over the body. A man in the habit of eating opium is upon a lower "standing than a man in perfect health."

Brigade-Surgeon J. H. Condon, M.D., M.R.C.S., &c., says :—

16,551. "Physically, it reduces strength, though like alcohol it gives a sort of "fictitious strength for a short time ; after a time varying with the amount "eaten daily, they become emaciated and debilitated, miserable-looking

"wretches, and finally die, most commonly of diarrhœa induced by the use of "opium."

Brigade-Surgeon Lieut.-Colonel A. Cameron, M.D., says :—

"Even when used in moderation for non-medical purposes, the habit is not "to be defended. Unless required for some bodily ailment a man is better "without it. Its habitual use, except in the smallest quantities, causes "emaciation and enfeeblement of the body, saps the energy, and dulls the "mental faculties." 12,572.

See also Q. 4042-4, 4718, 9360-3, 16,282, and many others.

QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES AS TO NON-INJURIOUS PHYSICAL EFFECTS OF OPIUM.

Surgeon-Major R. Cobb, M.D., says :—

"I believe the moderate use of opium to be quite an innocuous habit." 3704.

Surgeon-Colonel R. Harvey, M.D., M.R.C.P., &c., says :—

"The moderate way in which the great majority take it not only does them "no harm, but does them a great deal of good." 3420.

Mr. Sita Nath Roy, banker and zemindar, and secretary to the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, says :—

"The general impression, bordering on conviction, is that the moderate use "of opium is beneficial ; that it is a panacea for many diseases, and that its "tendency is to prolong life." 2706.

Brigade-Surgeon Lieut.-Colonel Purves, F.R.C.S.E., says :—

"I generally agree that the moderate use of opium in this country is rather "beneficial than otherwise." 3662.

See also 9524, 12,610, 15,907, 19,228.

NOTE R. to par. 33.—QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES AS TO INJURIOUS MORAL EFFECTS OF OPIUM.

Dr. Mookerjee says :—

"Its mental and moral effects are none the less harmful, and none the less "marked. It most certainly tarnishes the moral nature of man, weakening his "mental control over his will, and thus causing him to be the prey of the "evil and vicious habits of lying and stealing." 8805.

Brigade Surgeon Lieut.-Colonel Cameron, M.D., says that :—

"The general opinion amongst natives themselves is that in positions where "energy, alertness, a clear head, or a good memory is required, an opium-"eater is not to be trusted." 12,573.

Ram Kali Chaudhuri, retired Subordinate Judge, and late member of the Legislative Council of the North-West Provinces and Oudh, says :— 13,191.

"The results of the habit of opium-eating, whether considered physically, "mentally, or morally, are bad and condemnable. The consumer, as a general "rule, becomes both physically and mentally weak and inactive, and as a "consequence loses courage, and his moral conduct suffers so far as it depends "on the energy of body and mind, such as the performance of duties requiring "activity. In the early stage of the habit sexual virtue is disregarded, where "the initial motive was to increase sexual vigour."

Dr. Manohar Prasad Tewarie, L.M.S., says :—

"Its use in any of its forms deadens the intellect, impairs the physical and "moral sense, induces laziness, immorality, and debauchery." 15,146.

See also 9129, 9962, 10,496, 11,684, 18,706, and many others.

QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES AS TO NON-INJURIOUS MORAL EFFECTS.

14,414. The Hon. Sri Ram Rai, Bahadur, M.A., B.L., member of the Lieutenant-Governor's Council, says :—

"In no way, so far as my experience goes, does it lead to moral degradation."

14,226. Surgeon-Major J. Anderson, M.B., says :—

"In my experience it does not in any way lower the moral tone, nor does it "develop a propensity for gambling or sensuality."

See also 26,757, 19,228, 23,303, &c.

NOTE S. to par. 34.—QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES AS TO INJURIOUS SOCIAL EFFECTS OF OPIUM.

13,106. Dr. Isan Chandra Roy says :—

"They must satisfy their opium craving ; they are necessarily driven to have "recourse to all sorts of vicious acts, such as petty thefts, pickpocketing, &c."

13,191. Judge Ram Kali Chandhuri (already quoted) says :—

"Where there is little or no means, the habit leads the consumer to commit "petty thefts and trickeries."

See also 12,569, 3413, 9173, 25,490, 16,902, and many others.

QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES AS TO NON-INJURIOUS SOCIAL EFFECTS OF OPIUM.

Sir John Lambert, K.C.I.E., Commissioner of Police in Calcutta, says :—

5080. "I fail to discover any connexion between opium and crime of a serious "nature."

Mr. James Monro, C.B., formerly Commissioner of Police in Bengal, now engaged in missionary work, says :—

5463. "The conclusion which I came to from wide experience was that so far as "regards crime, opium has no perceptible influence in causing it."

See also 3184, 14,414, 19,749, 19,797, 25,583.

NOTE T. to par. 35.—PRO-OPIUMISTS' EVIDENCE AS TO PHYSICAL EFFECTS OF EXCESSIVE USE.

Surgeon-Major J. Anderson (already quoted) says :—

14,226. "When *taken to excess* it causes both moral and physical deterioration. It "produces emaciation, gastric disorder, loss of appetite, gives premature senile "expression, and no doubt shortens life. Morally, over-indulgence makes the "victim idle and timid, and engenders a habit of exaggeration."

Surgeon-Major G. W. P. Dennys, Civil Surgeon in the Punjab for many years, says :—

18,736. "A confirmed excessive opium-eater is generally a physical and mental "wreck, emaciated to an excessive degree, and incapable of performing any "ordinary work. He is a deplorable object to behold. . . . Excessive "opium-eaters have no stamina whatever, and succumb to comparatively "trivial ailments."

Mr. G. B. Prabhakar, L.R.C.P., a medical practitioner of Bombay, says :—

25,989. "Opium when taken in excess impairs the digestive system in general, "engenders lazy habits, causes dulness of intellect, and produces anæmia and "emaciation."

See also 12,608, 24,675, 25,657, 26,022, &c.

PRO-OPIUMISTS' EVIDENCE AS TO MORAL EFFECTS OF EXCESSIVE USE.

Lieut.-Colonel A. J. F. Reed, in command of 29th Punjab Infantry, says :—

"The habitual (*i.e.*, excessive) opium-eaters are marked men in the regiment, "and are not trusted like the rest." 18,706.

Surgeon-Major T. R. Mulroney, M.D., referring to those taking opium in large doses, says :—

"They are regular drunkards, a depraved lot, generally belonging to the "criminal class, thieves and burglars." 15,948.

See also 24,087, 26,022, &c.

NOTE U. to par. 35.—DIFFICULTY OF DISCONTINUANCE OF HABIT.

The personal experience of Mr. Datta may be usefully cited :—

"I took opium myself for three months, for chronic diarrhœa and dyspepsia. "The first day it acted like magic, but gradually the dose had to be increased, "until I used to take 20 grains of it. I keenly felt the after effects, and "thought of relinquishing. It took me some time before I gave it up by "gradually reducing the doses.

"If I did not take opium at the regular time, when I was used to taking it, 10,753.
"I was seized with nausea, pains all over the body, a sort of uneasiness which "cannot be described, a bad scalding sense of uneasiness all over the body. "Even if I took a lesser dose the diarrhœa would re-appear, and with greater "violence. I could not retain the smallest quantity of food, and I was not "able to work.

"It took me about four months to relinquish the habit, gradually reducing 10,754.
"the dose all that time. 10,755.

"I took other remedies to restore my health. I had to place myself under 10,756.
"other treatment."

There is abundance of other uncontradicted evidence to the like effect.

See also Q. 2593, 18,927, 25,513, 5913, 16,219, 28,168, and many others.

NOTE V. to par. 36.—COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF OPIUM ON NATIVES OF EUROPE AND OF INDIA.

Surgeon-General Sir Wm. Moore, K.C.I.E., Q.H.P., was asked by Sir Wm. Roberts :—

Q. "You would not admit it was due to some profound constitutional 1061.
"difference?"

A. "No, I don't think so."

Q. "But of course you would not be positive?" 1062.

A. "I do not think the constitutional difference has anything whatever to "do with it."

Surgeon Major-General Rice, head of the Indian Medical Department, says :—

"I have satisfied myself in my professional practice that Europeans are more 2199.
"tolerant, that is, require larger doses of opium than natives, bulk for bulk."

Dr. Rice further says :—

"To produce the same effect from a medincial dose of opium in a European 2200.
"you would have to give a larger quantity of it than you would to a native."

Hon. D. R. Lyall, C.S.I., says :—

"The ordinary native takes an amount of opium that would be almost 3205.
"laughed at in England as a dose of opium."

Surgeon Lieut.-Colonel J. McConaghey, M.D., was asked by Sir W. Roberts :—

12,626. *Q.* "Have you been able to notice, or been led to the opinion, that there is "a difference between the European constitution and the constitution of the "natives of India, in their relation to opium?

A. "I do not know that there is much difference.

12,631. "I have had Europeans under my treatment who were quite as much "addicted to the use of the drug as natives.

12,632. "Taking the population of the Europeans I meet with, it will be very "nearly the same proportion."

Dr. G. R. Ferris, M.R.C.S., was asked by Sir W. Roberts :—

4402. *Q.* "Has it never struck you that there was a difference of tolerance, "depending upon race or climate, or food, or the environment of Europeans "on the one hand, and of the inhabitants of India on the other?

A. "No. In Calcutta I have seen the greatest quantity taken by "Europeans. The maximum I have seen has been taken by a European."

Lieut -Colonel A. J. Wilcox, M.D., was asked by Mr. Mowbray :—

19,259. *Q.* "Have you had any experience of Europeans taking opium in this "country?

A. "Yes. I have stated that the worst cases I have met with have been "Europeans.

19,262. *Q.* "You think that the effect of opium on the Europeans who take it is "worse than on the natives?

A. "I do not think so. These cases I speak of were cases of extreme abuse."

See also 3387, 21,298, 19,363, 24,706.

NOTE V. V. to par. 38.—QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES AS TO PROHIBITION OF OPIUM, EXCEPT FOR MEDICAL PURPOSES.

8809. Rai Lal Madhub Mookerjee, Bahadur, President of the Calcutta Medical College, approves of the production of opium for medical use only :—

"To that extent and no further."

5844. Dr. Nil Ratan Sircar thinks it would be desirable to prohibit the sale of opium, except for medical purposes :—

5845. "So far as I can gauge public opinion, they (the people of India) will "support it (prohibition)."

Dr. Isan Chandra Roy says :—

13,108. "I am for limiting the use of opium strictly for medical purposes. Its use "as a narcotic indulgence should be prohibited by laws."

13,163. "And you believe that such a prohibition would be received with favour by "the people?—Yes."

19,519-21. Babu Bepin Behari Bose, M.A., a barrister at Lucknow, is in favour of prohibition, except for medical purposes, and says that such action would be supported by the general opinion of the country :—

19,522. "The opinion of the country is very settled on this point—that opium eating "is not good at all."

18,305-6. Pandit Gopi Nath, assistant manager of three newspapers, and secretary of two bodies of orthodox Hindus, is in favour of prohibition except for medical purposes, and thinks it would be generally approved :—

18,307. "It is nonsense to think that because opium is prohibited there will be any "riots."

Babu Ganga Prasad Varma, proprietor of two native newspapers at Lucknow, and a member of the Municipal Board, says:—

14,523. "It would be a blessing to my city if the Government stops the sale of

"opium, and strictly orders that none but those who require opium for medical "purposes should have it."

"I think the majority of the opium smokers themselves will agree with me." 14,525.

Rai Goonabhiram Borooah, Bahadur, retired Extra Assistant Commissioner of Assam, thinks it would be desirable to prohibit the use of opium except for medical purposes :— 9139.

"All but opium sellers and opium eaters will be in favour of it. Even they "would like it because their children would be saved." 9140.

Gobind Ram Chowdry, Tahsildar, Assam, says :—

"I wish it could be prohibited except for medical purposes." 19,288.

"The great majority, not being opium consumers, would certainly support "it. . . . There is nothing to fear from the natives of the country in "regard to prohibition." 19,289.

Mr. Kali Sankur Sukul, M.A., Professor in the City College, and Rector of the City Collegiate School, Calcutta, says :—

"The sale of opium, except for medical purposes, should be stopped." 9330.

"Undoubtedly public opinion would favour the total prohibition of opium, "except for medical purposes, especially if the country were assured that no "other taxation would follow." 9331.

See also 9932-3, 13,389, 15,009-10, 15,626-9, 18,261-2, 27,843-4, 11,692-3, 10,504-5, 4583, 16,569-76, 4298, 8021-2, 8342, 18,033-36, 19,733, 24,301, 8646-51, 9053-4, 9467-8, 11,449, 23,457, 24,335-6, 26,518, 26,587, and nearly a hundred others.

NOTE W. to par. 39.—FURTHER EVIDENCE AS TO OPIUM SMOKING.

Mr. G. M. Ogilvie, Second Financial Commissioner for the Punjab, said in reference to smoking :—

"This use of opium is generally reprobated. It is not practised by the "peasantry, and is, I believe, generally confined to the vicious classes of the "population." 15,698.

He added an opinion that in consequence of the discontinuance in the Punjab of licensing the sale of chandu and madak, the practice of smoking is rapidly decreasing in that province. 15,714.

Mr. T. Stoker, Commissioner of Excise for the North-West Provinces and Oudh, says :—

"I have nothing to say in favour of opium smoking. Speaking of these "provinces, I regard it as a low and vicious habit, practised, broadly speaking, "by low or by vicious people. It would be unreasonable to say that any "physical or moral deterioration which may have been observed in opium "smokers is necessarily due altogether to that particular practice and not to "other demoralising habits and associations or physical infirmities. . . . "But in these parts people who pursue the habit do in my opinion often or "generally suffer from it or its surroundings. The policy of the Government "of the North-Western Provinces has always been directed to repress and "check the practice and has been attended with success." 9527.

Surgeon-Major T. R. Mulroney, M.D., civil surgeon at Amritsar, referring to that district, says :—

"The class of opium-smokers is very limited. Four years ago the opium-"smoking shops were closed by order of the Government, and since then "opium smoking has apparently decreased ; it is confined to a very few, "generally a disreputable, debauched, and depraved lot." 15,945.

Numerous native witnesses, some holding important official positions, gave

similar evidence, particularly Mr. K. G. Gupta, Excise Commissioner of Bengal, who said :—

4975. "The effects of chandu and madak smoking are, however, distinctly harmful in the case of Indians, specially when they are unable to obtain nourishing food. Opium eating is not looked down upon, nor does it cause loss of respectability. But smoking chandu or madak is regarded as a degrading habit."

4976. ". . . the chandu or madak smoker is usually known by his appearance, and he is also generally believed to have deteriorated in many respects."

4977. "I think the effects of madak or chandu smoking in this country cannot well be concealed."

NOTE X. to par. 48.—OPIUM REVENUE.

Vol. II., p. 343. According to the figures in App. VIII. the average of the net opium revenue for the four years ending 1892-3 was Rx. 7,299,249.

Vol. II., p. 343. The Budget Estimate for 1893-4 was Rx. 5,967,104.

p. 67, Blue Book 92 of 1894. According to the "Financial Statement," the Budget Estimate for 1894-5 is ... ... Rx. 4,138,200

Vol. II., p. 343. to which must be added the net revenue from excise, which for the average of the five years ending 1893-4 was ... Rx. 985,129

making a total of ... ... Rx. 5,123,329

which taking the rupee at 1s. 1d. gives £2,775,136.

NOTE Y. to par. 32.—MEDICAL EVIDENCE AGAINST THE NEW THEORY THAT OPIUM IS A PROPHYLACTIC AGAINST FEVER.

A new theory—never heard of,—
4317; 4710; 8824-36; 10,617; 10,684; 11,851-69; 15,868; 16,168; 16,665; 19,378-80; 24,173.

Not used or recommended,—
3619; 4070; 4174-6; 8828; 12,476; 12,585; 12,633-4; 12,695; 13,337; 16,876; 17,275-7; 17,508; 24,777.

Not prescribed, even by pro-opiumists,—
3574; 11,895-6; 16,879-81; 19,258; 19,407.; 21,459-60; 24,675; 25,383.

Prophylactic properties denied,—
4710; 5837; 16,167; 16,558; 16,902; 17,152; 17,772-6; 19,203; 25,308.

Not known or used by the natives as a preventive,—
4277-80; 5836; 17,173; 19,406; 24,177-8; 25,361; 25,727; 25,861; 25,957; 26,041.

NOTE Z. to par. 50.

Osgathorpe Hills, Sheffield,
January 21, 1895.

DEAR LORD BRASSEY,

I have carefully considered your letters of the 2nd and 7th instant, the atter enclosing a copy of your letter to Sir James Lyall of the same date.

In the former of these letters you point out that if I am unable to agree with you and the majority, it will be "unprofitable to enter into a prolonged discussion," and that it will become my duty to state my own views in a dissentient report. You add that in the report which you will submit you "do not suppose that there will be found much room for amendment," and that "taking this view" you "do not anticipate that our further deliberations round the table need occupy many days."

In your letter to Sir James Lyall you "strongly insist that the completion "of our work has become of extreme urgency," and you say that "having "received two communications from the Secretary of State within the last few "days, I feel that my duty calls for some decided course of action. I do not

"believe that long discussion round the table will be necessary or desirable." * * * "I shall in any case relieve the Commission from further collective "work on the 26th."

Believing that full examination and consideration was the usual course, I was prepared to give all the time needful for the purpose. But as the majority of the Commission will probably be guided by your wishes in the matter, that course appears to be precluded.

Under these circumstances, it would not be right for me to attempt to discuss a few statements or arguments here and there in the Majority Report; for were I to do so, it would convey the impression that I was satisfied with whatever I did not challenge, and might be open to other objections. I must therefore confine myself, as you suggest, to a statement of my own views, some of which, I believe, are in accordance with those of Mr. Pease.

Entirely apart, however, from the considerations already referred to, I think it right to point out that in your letter to Sir James Lyall, you advise "personal "revision of the draft as now being circulated on the part of each member of "the Commission," adding that you would go "carefully through each revise "and endeavour to incorporate all suggestions which do not conflict with the "main conclusions."

Four new portions or chapters, apparently intended to form part of the report, have been circulated within the last few days; a further chapter has come to hand this morning, and at least three or four portions or chapters have yet to be supplied.

As we are to meet the day after to-morrow, it is impossible that your wish as to revision by each member, and the incorporation of suggestions, can now be carried out; and it cannot be right or proper that the Commission should adopt, as its own, any chapters or documents which its members have not had adequate means and opportunity to consider and approve.

I remain,
Dear Lord Brassey,
Yours faithfully,
HERNY J. WILSON.

The Right Hon. Lord Brassey, K.C.B.,
Chairman Royal Commission on Opium.

MEMORANDUM
ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE AUTHORITIES IN INDIA.

1. While in India I was obliged to express disapproval of the action of the Government of India, and of various officials, in relation to the Commission. As the after proceedings did not remove but strengthened this objection, it is due to the Commission and myself to place the main grounds of this objection on record.

In doing so I readily acknowledge the difficult position of the Indian authorities. Rightly or wrongly they appeared to hold in the main that the good government of India is bound up with the Opium Revenue. The difficulties arose from assuming an im-

partiality on the part of the Indian authorities which could not be, and was not, continuously enforced.

2. Some of the circumstances to which I am about to refer
Vol. V., p. 368. were stated in a letter addressed by me to Lord Brassey while we were in India, but the consideration given to them appeared to me inadequate. I have here omitted some and added others.

3. On the 18th November, 1893, it transpired that a telegram had been sent from the Government of India to the Secretary of State on the 15th August, containing the following passage:—
Vol. V., p. 362. "We shall be prepared to suggest non-official witnesses, who will "give independent evidence, but we cannot undertake to specially "search for witnesses who will give evidence against opium. We "presume this will be done by the Anti-Opium Society." As anti-opium evidence was easily available, without any special search, this official statement seemed to show that the authorities were taking up a partisan attitude.

4. Two days later a letter from Lord Lansdowne, then Viceroy of India, to Lord Brassey, Chairman of the Commission, was passed round to the members for perusal. It contained a statement in favour of the existing opium system, and against interference with that system as likely to lead to serious trouble. This appeared to me a departure from the judicial attitude which might have been expected from Her Majesty's Representative.

5. The Government of Madras was not allowed to present its own case to the Commission, but was instructed by the Government
Vol. V., p. 368 and p. 371. of India (13th December, 1893) to send to Calcutta abstracts of evidence of proposed witnesses. A letter of similar purport was addressed on the same day to the Resident at Hyderabad with
Vol. V., p. 373. regard to the evidence of other witnesses. Similar instructions were given to the Government of the North-West Provinces. I submit that this requirement was distinctly detrimental to the free expression of opinion and unprecedented in the history of Royal Commissions.

6. An official letter was sent [30th December, 1893] from the Government of the North-West Provinces and Oudh, to all Commissioners of Divisions, and other officials in these provinces,
Vol. V., p. 370. calling attention to the fact that some officials had "communicated "direct with the Secretary of the Commission, submitting to that "officer abstracts of the evidence," and pointing out "that there "is no authority for this procedure, and . . . . that all "communications should be addressed to this Government." Here, again, the authorities seemed determined that no evidence should be submitted to the Commission which had not been subjected to official scrutiny in high quarters. Moreover, this circular was not communicated to officials alone, but even to non-official persons who were intending, and were considered qualified, to give evidence on the subject of the inquiry.

7. At Benares, Mr. Isan Chandra Roy, M.B., stated that he had been officially invited to be a witness and to furnish an abstract of his intended evidence. After he forwarded his statement, he was informed by official letter, in which no reason was assigned, that his evidence was not required. The fact that he entertained anti-opium opinions was subsequently proved by his volunteered evidence before the Commission. Other proposed witnesses at Benares were similarly treated. III., 13,166.

8. At Bankipur, a list of witnesses intended to be called on the 3rd January, was supplied to me. It included the name of Rai Bahadur Jai Prakash Lal, C.I.E., Dewan of Dumraon. This gentleman represents a large estate in which poppy is extensively cultivated. He was not called. Information from two sources led me to believe that his evidence would not have been altogether favourable to the Government. The official version of this circumstance will be found in Vol. V., p. 355, paragraphs 4 to 10, and as I have commented on it in the Appendix to my dissent from the Report of the majority of the Commission, I will only add a strong expression of my opinion that as the Dewan was not called on the 3rd January, the Commission ought to have been informed that he was present on the 6th January. The withholding of that information was not creditable to those concerned.

9. At Lucknow 24 witnesses were called at the instance of the Government, 23 of whom gave evidence generally favourable to the Government case. Thinking that a different kind of evidence might have been omitted, Mr. R. M. Dane, who accompanied the Commission to manage the case on behalf of the Government of India, was, at my request, asked by Lord Brassey to put in the list of persons who had been asked by the authorities to give evidence at Lucknow, together with such abstracts of their evidence as had not already been produced. I thought the Commission was entitled to know the method that had been followed in making the selection of witnesses, and that the original list of witnesses, with the marks and notes upon it, would throw light on the subject. The list was not produced. It was stated that the names of Lucknow witnesses were included in the general list of all the witnesses for the North-West Provinces and Oudh; but that circumstance seems quite irrelevant, and an altogether insufficient reason. However, the names of 17 rejected witnesses extracted from the list were supplied, together with the abstracts of evidence of 16, four of whom seem to entertain anti-opium views, and four others make some strong observations against the use of opium. I would draw particular attention to the fact that two of these gentlemen, namely, Mr. P. Wyndham, C.S., Assistant Commissioner and Excise Officer, Sultánpur, and Mirza Muhammad Beg, Deputy Collector of Basti, make the

important statement that in their opinion revenue and rents derived from land would not be sensibly affected by the prohibition of poppy cultivation.

Vol. IV., p. 373.

10. At Bombay another instance of the anxiety of the authorities to prevent the free communication of information on the opium question was brought to light by the Rev. A. W. Prautch. An official circular had been issued desiring that information applied for by Mr. Ernest Hart, Chairman of the British Medical Association, should not be replied to, on the ground that "to reply to such applications might prove embarrassing."

11. I learned at Bankipur that the police at Gya had been searching out the movements of two of my friends and myself for the purpose of ascertaining with what persons we had had communication. As this matter formed the subject of protest on my part before the Commission, I need only refer to the Minutes of Evidence. I do not know whether on any other occasion we were similarly tracked.

Vol. III., pp. 10, 24, 25.

12. Perhaps the most notable instance of the Government method of preparing for the fair and honest inquiry expected in England will be found in the correspondence relating to the Native States of Rajputana. On the 9th September, 1893, the Government of India directed the agent of the Governor-General in Rajputana to invite the Durbars of the Native States to appoint witnesses to give evidence before the Commission, and also to nominate a British officer to give evidence as to those States. An abstract of his evidence was, as in other cases, to be forwarded to the Government of India. Accordingly, on the 22nd September, the agent, Col. G. H. Trevor, sent out a circular "to all political officers in Rajputana," desiring that the Durbars [Courts] of the Native States should be invited to nominate witnesses, and requesting the British officers addressed to furnish information and statistics. On the 5th October Lieut.-Colonel Abbott was appointed to give evidence himself, as well as to produce the witnesses, and arrange the evidence from the Native States—the request for a draft of his evidence being again repeated by the Government of India. Colonel Abbott then prepared a note on opium, which will repay careful perusal. He indicated the principal heads of evidence, and, among other things, suggested "that some stalwart Sondhia, Mewati, and "Rajput lumberdars and patels should be among the witnesses "selected." He made numerous other suggestions as to matters of detail entirely in favour of the existing state of things, and without any provision for ascertaining and proving any matters of an adverse character, either of fact or of opinion. He advised that the witnesses "should reach Ajmere a week in advance" of the Commission, and supplied the reason, namely, "that I may "become acquainted with all, and see if each one understands on

Vol. IV., p. 384.

Vol. IV., p. 385.

Vol. IV., p. 386.

"what points he is required to give evidence." He also made careful suggestions for preparing ample claims for compensation. On the 29th November "all political officers" were again addressed on the subject as follows:—"Mr. R. M. Dane, C.S., "the officer selected by the Government of India to advise local "Administrations in the matter of preparing for the inquiry to be "held by the Opium Commission, has had an opportunity of "seeing the previous correspondence on that subject in this "office, and has pointed out that the great importance of the "inquiry . . . has apparently not been fully appreciated ". . . that Rajputana is vitally interested in the inquiry," and that "there should be no lack of evidence, both official and "non-official, to prove before the Commission the full extent of "their rights and interests in opium." The suggestion was repeated that witnesses were, if practicable, to be "ready in "Ajmere about a week in advance of the Commission's arrival "there." Taken altogether, this correspondence is, in my opinion, as one-sided as the instructions in a brief in a partisan cause, and the evidence, which in accordance with these suggestions, was prepared and put before the Commission at Ajmere, was of an unusually partial and one-sided character.

Vol. IV., p. 387.

13. The instances I have given as to the action of the authorities appear to me inconsistent with any real desire on their part that the whole of the facts should come in a perfectly unbiassed manner before the world. Whatever the Government of India intended by their determination not to seek for evidence of an anti-opium character, its action was likely to be understood, and was undoubtedly understood, to mean that pro-opium evidence was to be sought for, and anti-opium evidence was not.

See par. 4.

14. Lord Brassey himself had early recognised the true position of the Government, as is clear from his statement to Mr. Alexander, the Secretary of the Anti-Opium Society, at the close of his evidence before the Commission:—"We all appreciate that "in the encounter in which you are engaged with the Government "of India upon its own ground you are placed in circumstances of "no ordinary difficulty."

Q. 2588.

15. My contention on this subject is, that having regard to the nature of British authority in India, and to the moral timidity of many residents in India, both Native and European, it was the duty of the Government, in the presentation of evidence to be adduced before the Commission, to have publicly assured the people generally that no harm would come to them by giving free expression to their views, however opposed such views might be to the interests of the Revenue, or the known predilection of English officials. In fact it should have given practical effect to Mr. Westland's message read by the Chairman at the commencement of the proceedings on the 27th December:—"The Govern-

Vol. II., p. 274.

"ment, however, will not reply to such evidence [that is anti-opium "evidence] as a defendant, but will merely pursue their course of "enabling the Commission to fully ascertain the actual facts."

16. In view of the various incidents which came to my knowledge, and some of which are here set forth, I am driven to the conclusion that the authorities in India have not pursued their declared "course of enabling the Commission to fully "ascertain the actual facts."

HENRY J. WILSON.

A FURTHER PROTEST.

The following correspondence is printed at the end of Vol. VII. of the Commission's Proceedings, after the Index and glossary of Indian terms, as Appendix H., with the note :—

"This correspondence is added to the proceedings in compliance with the "Chairman's undertaking expressed in the last paragraph of his letter of the "10th December."

Osgathorpe Hills, Sheffield,
December 5th, 1894.

DEAR LORD BRASSEY,

I am sorry that it should be needful for me to complain in reference to certain matters connected with the Commission.

I. I am informed by Mr. Baines that no minutes of the proceedings of the Commission have been kept, or, at any rate, are now available. This, I understand, is entirely contrary to the usual practice.

II. It appears to me that our Indian colleagues have not been treated with the consideration to which they were entitled in reference to their coming to this country for the purpose of taking part in our deliberations on the Report. As regards the Maharaja of Darbhanga, it was, I am aware, generally understood that he was not willing to undertake the journey, but that general understanding was no reason why he should not have been formally and courteously invited. The case of Mr. Haridas is different. He appeared to be desirous of coming; and had he been formally and courteously invited at the proper time, before he had resumed his duties as Dewan of Junagarh, there is every reason to believe that he would have been glad to accept the invitation; in fact, he distinctly stated that your Lordship told him you would inform him in June as to whether his presence would be required in England, and had he been so then informed he would doubtless have been able to avoid taking up his new appointment in August last.

III. It appears that when at last, in consequence of my representations, Mr. Haridas was invited to come to this country, the communication was not sent direct to him, but through the India

Office, and then successively through the Government of India and the Government of Bombay. This was, I submit, a departure from the usual practice of Royal Commissions, and distinctly derogatory to the position of such a Commission and of a Royal Commissioner. Mr. Haridas has thus been treated as though he were merely an official under the Indian Government, to be communicated with through the usual system of official routine.

IV. It appears further that our Indian colleagues have not been promptly furnished with the sections of the Draft Report. Four parts were received by me up to the 2nd of August, and might have been in their hands in the third week of the month, whereas Mr. Haridas, when he wrote on the 9th October, had not received any part.

V. The Secretary of the Commission sent for my perusal a letter from Mr. Fanshawe addressed to the Chairman, proposing that the correspondence between the Indian Government, the Commission, and myself in reference to the action of the authorities should be published in the Appendix. I returned to the Secretary the letter of Mr. Fanshawe, saying that I did not object to such publication, but that the last letter of the series, namely, that dated the 3rd February, 1894, should have a note appended to it indicating that it had not been communicated to me for three months after the date it bore. My request has not been complied with, and our Secretary informs me that it was ignored by him on his own responsibility. I submit that in so acting he exceeded the limits of his authority.

I have to request that you will be so good as to place this letter before the Commission at a suitable but early part of the meeting on the 7th instant.

I remain,
Dear Lord Brassey,
Yours faithfully,
HENRY J. WILSON.

The Right Honourable Lord Brassey, K.C.B.

Normanhurst Court, Battle,
10th December, 1894.

MY DEAR WILSON,—

I much regret that your letter of December 5th, but which bears on the envelope the London postmark of December 7th, did not reach me in time for discussion at the last meeting of the Commission. As to the keeping of minutes, there had been no meetings of the Commission since we separated at Bombay. A shorthand writer has been present at every meeting, and his notes have been printed. As regards the invitations to our Indian colleagues, I did not think it desirable to invite them to England

until the Report was ready for discussion. You know the delays, and the causes of the delay. As soon as I knew the approximate date when we should be ready for a conference, I informed the India Office. I cannot think that our Indian colleagues would themselves take exception to the mode in which they have been treated. Nothing could have been more cordial than our relations in India from the beginning to the end. I endeavoured to show them in every way the same friendly regard and the same deference to any suggestions or opinions which they advanced, which I have always desired to show to my English colleagues.

I will forward your letter to Mr. Fanshawe and Mr. Baines for any explanations. The correspondence can be published with the minutes of our proceedings. Yours sincerely,

BRASSEY.

Forwarded to Mr. Fanshawe with Mr. Wilson's letter, in compliance with the Chairman's concluding paragraph.

J. A. BAINES.
Secretary.

14th December, 1894.

Endorsement by Mr. Fanshawe :—

I have read and now return this correspondence, which I cannot help thinking has been sent to me under some misapprehension. There is nothing, so far as I can see, in Mr. Wilson's letter of the 5th instant on which I am called upon to offer any remarks.

14th December, 1894. A. U. FANSHAWE.

Endorsement by the Secretary :—

As regards the last paragraph of Mr. Wilson's letter, I have to explain that, in a note received from him dated the 24th of July, he wrote—"If you "are going to have the correspondence in question put in type, I think "there ought to be an endorsement to the effect that Mr. Hewett's letter to the "Government of India, Camp Ajmere, 3rd February, 1894, was not communi- "cated to me until the 1st of May, 1894—three months after date. I shall, "of course, have something to say on the whole subject hereafter."

Mr. Wilson did not inform me that he was kept in ignorance of the fact that such a reply had been sent or of the purport of its contents. The records are the common property of the Commission, accessible to every member. It is neither usual nor necessary, therefore, to formally communicate correspondence to individual members, who have the official copy available for reference. Mr. Wilson was present with the Commission up to the 20th February, and to have added a note to the effect he suggested involves the implication that he was debarred from access to the records and from due knowledge of what action his colleagues had taken in a matter in which he was materially interested. In omitting the endorsement, therefore, I considered it superfluous to refer to the Chairman. The only member of the Commission to whom I informally showed the proposal agreed with my view as to the misapprehension to which such a note would give rise.

J. A. BAINES,
Secretary.

Further endorsement :—

This correspondence was placed by the Secretary for disposal at the meetings of the 23rd, 24th, and 25th January, but other work blocked the way.

J. A. BAINES.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE OPIUM TRADE.

THE OPIUM HABIT IN THE EAST: A Study of the Evidence given to the Royal Commission on Opium, 1893-4. By JOSHUA ROWNTREE. Price One Shilling in Paper Wrappers; Cloth Boards 1s. 6d.

LOTUS-EATING AND OPIUM-EATING: A Reply to Sir Lepel Griffin. By JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER, LL.B., Hon. Sec. of the Society. Reprinted from the *Contemporary Review*. Price One Penny.

THE DEBATE ON THE OPIUM QUESTION: June 30th, 1893, reprinted from the Official Parliamentary Report. Price One Shilling.

THE POPPY HARVEST. A Study in Anglo-Indian Ethics. By the Rev. T. G. SELBY (12 years Missionary in China). With 12 Coloured Illustrations, from Chinese Cartoons. Price Sixpence.

THE FRIEND OF CHINA. The Organ of the Society. Quarterly. Price Threepence. Sent free to all annual subscribers of 2s. 6d. and upwards.

NEW SERIES OF ANTI-OPIUM TRACTS.

4pp. Tracts, 2s. per 100.

No. 8.—China's Curse and Britain's Guilt. By the Rev. GRIFFITH JOHN, D.D., of Hankow.

No. 14.—England's Opium Policy. Weighty opinions on the subject.

No. 15.—The Argument from the Sikhs. By JOSHUA ROWNTREE. Illustrated.

No. 16.—What Chinese Statesmen say. By JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER, LL.B.

LEAFLET SERIES.

1s. per 100.

No. 6.—A Chinaman on the Opium Trade. A speech delivered at Melbourne by Mr. CHEOK HONG CHEONG.

No. 7.—The Archbishop of Dublin on the Opium Trade.

No. 8.—An Opium Experience. Reprinted from the *Spectator*.

HANDBILL SERIES.

6d. per 100, 4s. per 1,000.

(Printed on one side only, the other side being intended for notices of meetings.)

No. 1.—Reasons why every Christian should protest against the Opium Trade.

No. 3.—Archdeacon Wolfe's Appeal to British Christians. Reprinted from the *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, Feb., 1893.

"MISSIONARY TESTIMONIES" SERIES (Leaflet).

6d. per 100, 4s. per 1,000.

No. 1.—By the Ven. Archdeacon Moule, Church Missionary Society.

No. 6.—By the Rev. J. S. and Mrs. Adams, American Baptist Mission.

JUVENILE.

One Halfpenny, or 3s. 6d. per 100.

Poppies: A talk with English Boys and Girls about Opium. By a Lady. Twelve pages. Three full-page illustrations.

May be obtained through any Bookseller; of P. S. KING & SON, Parliamentary Booksellers, 12, King Street, Westminster, S.W.; or from the Secretary, Finsbury House, Blomfield Street, London, E.C.

The following may also be obtained at the Society's office:—

Britain's Opium Harvest. A monthly periodical, published by the Women's Anti-Opium Urgency Committee. Price 1s. 6d. per annum, post free.

Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade.

President—SIR JOSEPH WHITWELL PEASE, BART, M.P.

Vice-Presidents:

The Most Rev. LORD PLUNKET, ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.
The Rt. Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.
The Rt. Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.
The Rt. Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.
The Rt. Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF CARLISLE.
The Lord POLWARTH.
The Lord OVERTOUN.
Gen. SIR ARTHUR COTTON, R.E., K.C.S.I.
The Rev. Professor LEGGE, D.D.
DAVID M'LAREN, Esq., J.P.
H. W. MAYNARD, Esq.
The Rev. F. B. MEYER, B.A.
The Rt. Rev. G. E. MOULE, D.D., Bishop of Mid-China.
The Rev. W. F. MOULTON, D.D.
Sir BENJAMIN W. RICHARDSON, Bart., M.D., F.R.S.
Sir MARK J. STEWART, Bart., M.P.
The Rev. Canon WILBERFORCE, M.A.

Executive Committee:

CHARLES F. HARFORD-BATTERSBY, Esq., M.D.*
ALFRED H. BAYNES, Esq., F.R.G.S.†
MORTON P. BETTS, Esq.
Sir MATTHEW DODSWORTH, Bart.
HENRY GURNEY, Esq.
THOMAS HANBURY, Esq.
JOHN HILTON, Esq.
Rev. NICHOLAS HURRY.‡
JOHN MOLINEUX, Esq., C.B.§
Ven. Archdeacon MOULE, B.D.
Rev. GEORGE PIERCY.
Brigade-Surgeon ROBERT PRINGLE, M.D.
JOSHUA ROWNTREE, Esq.
FRED. SESSIONS, Esq., F.R.G.S.**
SAMUEL SOUTHALL, Esq.
ARTHUR C. STERRY, Esq.
Lieut.-Gen. TREMENHEERE, C.B.
HENRY WIGHAM, Esq.

Representing the
*Church Missionary Society. †Baptist Missionary Society. ‡London Missionary Society.
§Wesleyan Missionary Society. **Friends' Foreign Mission Association.

Chairman—DONALD MATHESON, ESQ.

Honorary Secretary—JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER, LL.B.

Organizing Secretary—REV. G. A. WILSON, M.A.

General Council:

ARTHUR ALBRIGHT, Esq.
WM. S. ALLEN, Esq.
Rev. JOSEPH ANGUS, D.D.
W. H. ARCHDALE, Esq.
J. GURNEY BARCLAY, Esq.
Dr. T. J. BARNARDO.
JOHN BARRAN, Esq., M.P.
Rev. G. S. BARRETT, D.D.
Rev. H. J. BERGUER.
W. BICKFORD-SMITH, Esq.
J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, Esq.
H. BROADHURST, Esq.
Rev. HENDERSON BURNSIDE.
THOMAS BURT, Esq., M.P.
W. S. CAINE, Esq., M.P.
Sir CHARLES CAMERON, Bart., M.D., LL.D., M.P.
Sir W. T. CHARLEY, Q.C., D.C.L.
Rev. Canon CHRISTOPHER, M.A.
JAMES CLARK, Esq.
WILLIAM S. CLARK, Esq.
F. C. CLAYTON, Esq.
J. J. COLMAN, Esq., M.P.
JAMES COWAN, Esq.
Very Rev. Dean COWIE, D.D.
Rev. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, M.A.
Rev. Principal GETHIN DAVIES, D.D.
Very Rev. Dean DICKINSON, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Principal EDWARDS, D.D.
J. PASSMORE EDWARDS, Esq.
Rev. C. C. FENN, M.A.
ROBERT FERGUSON, Esq., J.P.
W. FOWLER, Esq.
FREDERICK H. FOX, Esq.
LEWIS FRY, Esq.
Sir THEODORE FRY, Bart., M.P.
Rev. J. P. GLEDSTONE.
Rev. BENJAMIN GREGORY, D.D.
Rev. H. GRATTAN GUINNESS, D.D.
Major-Gen. F. T. HAIG.
Rev. D. B. HANKIN.
WILLIAM HARVEY, Esq.
Sir ISAAC HOLDEN, Bart., M.P.
ALFRED HOWELL, Esq.
Rev. Canon H. SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A.
ISAAC HOYLE, Esq.
His Honour Judge HUGHES, Q.C., F.S.A.
Rev. SAMUEL HULME.
Rev. JAMES HUNTER, B.D.
ALFRED ILLINGWORTH, Esq., M.P.
Rev. E. E. JENKINS, D.D., LL.D.
Rev. GRIFFITH JOHN, D.D.
Sir J. H. KENNAWAY, Bart., M.P.
Sir THOMAS LEA, Bart., M.P.
WM. LOCKHART, Esq., F.R.C.S., F.R.G.S.
ALEX. McARTHUR, Esq.
Rev. R. MACBETH.
JUSTIN McCARTHY, Esq., M.P.
Rev. ALEX. MACLAREN, D.D.
JAMES E. MATHIESON, Esq., J.P.
W. C. MAUGHAN, Esq., J.P.
CHARLES H. MELDON, Esq., Q.C., LL.D.
Rev. H. C. MILWARD, M.A.
W. MORGAN, Esq.
Rt. Hon. ARNOLD MORLEY, M.P.
Rev. HANDLEY C. G. MOULE, M.A.
Rev. GAVIN S. MUIR, M.A.
Major-General W. HATT NOBLE.
The Lord NORTHBOURNE.
FRANCIS PARRY, Esq., F.R.G.S.
R. W. PERKS, Esq., M.P.
Rev. W. T. RADCLIFFE.
J. JAMES RIDGE, Esq., M.D.
THOMSON SHARP, Esq.
Rev. H. C. SQUIRES, M.A.
Rev. W. M. STATHAM.
Rev. Canon STOWELL, M.A.
JOSEPH STURGE, Esq.
Rev. R. WARDLAW THOMPSON.
JOSEPH THOMSON, Esq., F.R.G.S.
Rev. J. F. B. TINLING, B.A.
Rev. F. STORRS TURNER, B.A.
E. B. UNDERHILL, Esq. LL.D.
S. D. WADDY, Esq., Q.C.
ALFRED WEBB, Esq., M.P.
Rev. Prebendary WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P.
Rev. P. H. WICKSTEED, M.A.
JOHN WILSON, Esq., M.P. (Govan).
Rev. J. H. WILSON, D.D.

Bankers—Messrs. BARCLAY, BEVAN, RANSOM, BOUVERIE & Co., LIMITED.

Office—Finsbury House, Blomfield Street, London, E.C.

Contributions in aid of the Society's operations will be thankfully received by the HON. SECRETARY at the Office. Cheques should be crossed BARCLAY & Co.